

OKLAHOMA

Nellie S. Hall to be postmaster at Canton, Okla., in place of N. S. Hall. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Maude S. Chambers to be postmaster at Jenks, Okla., in place of M. S. Chambers. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1932.

Clark Moss to be postmaster at Wagoner, Okla., in place of E. B. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired February 10, 1931.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry D. Stevens to be postmaster at Folcroft, Pa., in place of H. D. Stevens. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Anna R. Parker to be postmaster at Kulpmont, Pa., in place of A. R. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired January 9, 1933.

Eleanor Niland to be postmaster at West Brownsville, Pa., in place of Eleanor Niland. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William H. F. Faddis to be postmaster at Clearwater, S. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1932.

TENNESSEE

Homer W. Black to be postmaster at Bolivar, Tenn., in place of H. W. Black. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1933.

TEXAS

Sylvan S. McCrary to be postmaster at Joaquin, Tex., in place of S. S. McCrary. Incumbent's commission expired December 18, 1932.

WEST VIRGINIA

William O. Crawford to be postmaster at Cabin Creek, W. Va., in place of W. O. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

Monroe Burns to be postmaster at Cairo, W. Va., in place of Monroe Burns. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

James R. Wratchford to be postmaster at Moorefield, W. Va., in place of J. R. Wratchford. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1933.

Thomas A. Jones to be postmaster at Mount Hope, W. Va., in place of T. A. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1933.

WISCONSIN

Fred Hennig to be postmaster at Bowler, Wis., in place of Fred Hennig. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

Jessie M. McGeorge to be postmaster at Stone Lake, Wis., in place of J. M. McGeorge. Incumbent's commission expires February 25, 1933.

Arthur Heins to be postmaster at Tigerton, Wis., in place of Arthur Heins. Incumbent's commission expires February 28, 1933.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1933

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit Divine, Thou dost prefer before all temples a pure and an upright heart. Instruct us, for Thou knowest; illuminate us, that Thy ways to the world may be justified. Thou hast provided for us One who stands for us in the moral gap of sin. With all our hearts may we love and know Him; bless us with the peace of a perfect trust. Thy Holy Word is with us: "A man shall be as a hiding place from the tempest and a refuge from the storm; as rivers of water in a dry place and as a shadow of a great rock in a weary land." O God, in this hour especially, make our lives strong, helpful, and beneficent; how this old earth is mourning for

such. Arouse us with unflinching powers and influences that shall deliver our country out of the valley of distress and revive an emancipating hope and faith everywhere. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 11, 1933, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7716) entitled "An act to amend the radio act of 1927, approved February 23, 1927, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 47, ch. 4), and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COUZENS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. FESS, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. DILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 4339. An act repealing certain provisions of the act of June 21, 1906, as amended, relating to the sale and encumbrance of lands of Kickapoo and affiliated Indians of Oklahoma.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2148) entitled "An act for the relief of Clarence R. Killion," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REED, Mr. CUTTING, and Mr. FLETCHER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EQUALIZATION OF TARIFF DUTIES

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 8557) to equalize tariff duties by compensating for depreciation in foreign currencies, on the calendar of motions to discharge committees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself two minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote for or against the consideration of legislation which has for its purpose the protection of American markets from invasion and destruction by floods of importations from foreign countries whose currencies have depreciated.

This is a vote that should not be approached from a party standpoint but from a truly American standpoint, as it provides simply for consideration of legislation to protect American industry, American workers employed therein, and the products of the American farms from unfair foreign competition. A vote for the motion really is a vote for America and American products first and foreign nations and foreign products second. Every country has an inherent and prior right to its home markets. We should defend those markets and hold them for our own nationals as a matter of right, just as we would defend our soil against the invasion of an enemy alien army.

I particularly call upon the progressive Republicans who, with me in 1923, supported the discharge rule and claimed we had won a great victory when it was incorporated in the rules of the House.

I call upon the Democratic progressives and the Republican progressives to join with us to-day and vote for this motion in order to bring before the House for consideration this important legislation which has been chloroformed in committee and grant the opportunity desired by 145 Members who signed the discharge petition. Let your actions confirm your promises.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am one of those who voted against the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. I did so for the reason that although I am a firm believer in a protective tariff I feared

the consequences of retaliatory tariffs; however, the question before us to-day is whether or not we are to consider the great influx of goods which are coming into this country by reason of the depreciated currency abroad.

If it is true that the great portion of these goods are crippling our manufacturers by the sale of merchandise far below the cost of production, then the present tariff is not even a competitive tariff, so far as such goods are concerned.

It ought to at least be carefully considered on the floor of this House. I am one who wishes to hear the arguments on both sides with an open mind. Ten minutes' debate on each side is a joke. Bring the Crowther bill on the floor, subject to amendments, produce the proper statistics, grant plenty of time for debate, and let us consider the matter in the way that all important measures should be considered in this Congress.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, as we have only one speech on this side.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I have 10 minutes, and I have promised to yield 5 minutes of the time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I now yield myself two minutes.

Mr. Speaker, of course, in this limited time it is impossible to go into a discussion of the merits of this question. I may simply say that I shall not make the charge that the Hawley-Smoot bill is responsible for the depression we are in, but I do make the charge, without fear of successful contradiction, that the prohibitive rates in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill have done more to aggravate and continue this depression than any other one thing. Furthermore, it was an active issue in the last campaign, and the American people have repudiated it.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I can not yield in two minutes, and the gentleman should not expect me to.

I may say in regard to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] we were engaged in hearings on the Hill bill, which is similar to his bill, and we had the experts from the Tariff Commission, as well as other men of national prominence, waiting to be heard when this bill was taken from the committee by the rule to discharge; and I may say further that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] has never asked the chairman or, as far as I can learn, any other member of the committee for a hearing on his bill. The first intimation I had that the gentleman from New York had a bill was when the gentleman from Wisconsin brought in a motion to discharge.

The chief economist of the Tariff Commission, who is also a great political economist—

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman knows I can not yield in two minutes for a legal discussion from my good friend from Illinois.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute more.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. COLLIER. The gentleman will not permit.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. We had hearings on the Crowther bill before the committee in May of last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute more.

Mr. Durand, the chief economist of the Tariff Commission, said that the Crowther bill was an embargo against all the world.

Every man who votes for this motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin is not only voting to indorse the Hawley-Smoot Act, but is indorsing it with an increase of anywhere from 25 to 50 per cent and as much as 800 per cent against some countries, and, according to the chief economist of the Tariff Commission is also voting for a bill which is an embargo against the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 8557, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] has for its title, "To equalize tariff duties by compensating for depreciation in foreign countries."

Strictly speaking, this is not a vote on the measure itself, but is upon a motion to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from its consideration and place it upon immediate passage. The motion involved is an extraordinary one. Some may say that they are opposed to discharging the committee under the admitted facts that it has in no sense been recreant of its duties toward this legislation. In the last session hearings were had upon the identical bill before the whole committee. With the party lines broken, the committee voted against reporting it out 16 to 9. Last spring, before the election, when this measure was considered on its merits, three of the Republican members voted against reporting it from the committee, one of whom was the distinguished gentleman who just made his interrogation, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM]. [Applause.]

However, it is not necessary to hide behind the parliamentary situation in opposing this motion. The bill is a vicious one and actually defeats, in many instances, the laudable purpose claimed for it by its sponsors. As a matter of fact, it is simply a political gesture out of which our Republican friends hope to secure some solace.

We direct our attention to the bill itself and the result that would flow from it if it were enacted into law:

First. Propaganda claims that the country is flooded with importations from the depreciated-currency countries. This is conclusively refuted in the fact that imports into this country for the first 11 months of 1932 were less than the imports for a similar period in 1931. The official figures are as follows: \$1,424,473,000 for 1932, and \$2,199,611,000 for 1931. Dutiable imports for 1932, \$466,192,000, as against \$743,280,000 for like period in 1931.

The official figures from the Tariff Commission show that there was a decrease for this period in 1932, over like period in 1931, of 33 per cent in value and 20 per cent in volume.

Further, it is unquestioned that the exports from this country to the depreciated-currency countries in each particular instance, exceeds the imports from those countries during the past year. Another statement might be significant—the value of all our dutiable imports for 1932 are slightly over \$500,000,000. The value of all imports for the year 1929 is \$4,399,361,000. The proponents of this bill are in a ridiculous position when they say that this country is being flooded with imports when a few short months ago they were proclaiming that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was protecting American farmers, and laborers, and industry from this very evil. Then, the value of all imports for the last year is one-third of the imports of 1929, the last year before the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Second. This bill creates a tariff upon every article imported from a country that has depreciated its currency. When the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill was written, the articles placed upon the free list certainly were articles that should have been placed thereon. Now, without rhyme or reason, without an effort for matured deliberation, the proponents of this measure would place every such article on the dutiable list.

As a matter of fact, many of the larger articles concerning which most propaganda has been concerned are articles on the free list. Newspaper print and wood pulp have been on the free list for many, many years. This measure would automatically put a tariff of different proportions upon this commodity, as well as others now on the free list.

Third. The date fixed in the bill for determining when the depreciation of currency occurred is October 1, 1931. Many nations had depreciated their currency prior to that time. France, who cut the franc 80 per cent in value, yet remained on the gold standard, would not be affected by this measure. Without doubt, France, the defaulter, would be given marked preference over our neighbor Canada, and our kinsman, Great Britain, who met the promised payment on her debt.

Fourth. Upon Saturday, the distinguished leader of the minority, Mr. SNELL, in colloquy with me, had this to say relative to the Crowther bill:

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman realize that the nations who depreciated their currency prior to the date fixed, whether it be October 1, 1931, or some date in 1932, will have an advantage over those countries that have depreciated their currency subsequent to the date fixed in the bill.

Mr. SNELL. I want to use them all alike, I want to use them exactly the same. I want to see to it, in other words, that imports coming from those countries at the present time shall come in under what is practically American valuation.

This measure does not "use them all alike" or "use them exactly the same"; it does not substantially give similar treatment, nor does it permit imports from the countries affected to "come in under what is practically American valuation." The things that the distinguished gentlemen from New York wants can not take place under this scheme. There would be manifold discriminations. American valuation would not be involved. The language of the bill excludes that. The different nations have depreciated their currency at different times, in different amounts, and with different rates. Japan, for instance, has depreciated her yen 50 per cent; England depreciated her pound practically 25 per cent; France depreciated her franc 80 per cent before the date set forth in the bill, and as stated, is now on a gold basis. Any increase in the rate of any commodity shipped by these three countries would penalize England and Japan and benefit France—all without benefit accruing to American industry or the American people. France would get the benefit of the market which would be taken from the less-favored nations.

Mr. SNELL again said, as late as last Saturday, on the floor:

I would like to change a lot of things in the bill myself and I am not going to get in an argument about the details of the bill.

My friends, it is striking indeed that no argument was made by the gentleman from New York in favor of this particular bill. This is the bill to be considered. The proponents talk in pleasing generalities. In my opinion they have no hope of its consideration and are merely making effort to secure some supposed political advantage in the situation.

For instance, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] made a very sincere speech on the floor of the House last Saturday. He was lamenting the tragedy of our industrial communities. Most of his discussion dealt with the importation of Belgian skelp, which is fabricated into steel pipe. He charged that after it was so fabricated, it was sold on the American market in competition with the products of our own steel industry. Then, he referred to the fact that steel bars, tin, and pig iron were being imported into the country from foreign lands. Then he asked the gentleman from Arkansas how he could stand for and justify the importation of such products into our country, which is taking business and work from our American industry and American labor.

Now, I would not be harsh with the gentleman from Ohio, because he is a very distinguished and capable Member of this House, and I can join with him in my desire to see American labor and American industry fairly protected in the onslaught on it from other lands. But the gentleman need not worry about the effect of Belgian skelp imported into this country. In fact, there is such a small amount of it that we have been unable in the limited time to segregate it from other imported articles. However, the Tariff Commission gives us the information that all of the boiler and plate and skelp, together with all other articles described in paragraph 307 of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, aggregated 752 tons in the year 1931, with a valuation of \$32,306; that the same imports for 1932 totaled 409 tons, with a value of \$9,088. There is some skelp that was imported under paragraph 308 of the Smoot-Hawley Act, together with other steel products. In 1931 all of the articles in paragraph 308 totaled 10,827 tons, or a valuation of \$416,147. In 1932 all of these commodities, including skelp, aggregated 3,931 tons, with a value of \$100,681. The Tariff Commission gives us the information that very little skelp is imported into this

country. It is plain to see that the total tonnage and the total values are infinitesimal as compared to the total steel production. And if by any stretch of the imagination any effect is felt from their importation, there has been a decrease of 45 per cent in the tonnage of imports under paragraph 307 in 1932 as compared to the preceding year, and a decrease of more than 70 per cent in the value of such imports for like period. With reference to the skelp contained in paragraph 308, supra, we see a reduction of practically 60 per cent in tonnage and almost 80 per cent in value for 1932 over 1931.

The same decrease, both in tonnage and value, which must mean decrease in competition with American products, is found with reference to steel bars. In 1931 steel bars had a value of not over 3½ cents per pound, showing a tonnage of 46,759 tons, valued at \$1,009,223. In 1932 tonnage was reduced to 29,628 tons, with a value of \$488,696. For steel bars valued at 3½ cents and more in 1931 tonnage was 3,259 tons, valued at \$522,393. For 1932 this tonnage had reduced to 1,493 tons, with a value of \$233,058. So by no stretch of the imagination can any condition of the steel industry or any unemployment connected with it come from the depreciated currency of foreign countries.

The quantity and value are clearly indicative that it could not be of material effect upon the steel industry of this country; but if it were, Belgian skelp would not be kept out of this country, nor tariff upon it increased, because Belgium is one of the nations that is on the gold standard and, consequently, is not affected by this bill. This situation obtains with relation to all steel products from Belgium, France, Germany, and other nations who have not depreciated their currency.

We have received a tremendous amount of propaganda relating to rubber shoes. The industry is at low ebb which is blamed on the depreciated currency of other nations. This competition comes from Japan and Czechoslovakia. The record shows that Japan has depreciated her currency while Czechoslovakia has not. Then, the Tariff Commission, just a few days ago, under the flexible provision of the tariff act, increased the tariff on the rubber goods imported from all nations, rather than attempt to set up tariff rates affecting separate nations and different conditions.

With the exception of wood pulp, upon which there is no tariff, and rubber shoes, upon which the Tariff Commission has acted, the imports of tuna fish have been used as a typical case of the effect of depreciated currency in foreign lands. To hear one side of the story, only one conclusion could be reached and that was the depreciation of Japan's yen has spelled the doom of the American canned-tuna-fish industry. But there are other conditions which have entered into and caused the loss of this business to American industry. The demand was created in this country for white tuna fish; our industry purchased it in bulk from Japan; it was shipped here in frozen state and canned by American labor and sold by American industry. Now, here is what happened. Japan is canning her own tuna fish; she is shipping the product that the American people want—the white tuna—in cans. The American industry can not secure white tuna; the best they can do is to get the striped tuna in the Mexican waters and offer it in competition with the preferred article. So, it is apparent that the controlling reason for the disappearance of white tuna as an American product is due to the change in policy by Japan.

Under date of November 30, 1932, Mr. Dow, Commissioner of Customs, wrote the Secretary of Treasury a letter on the depreciated-currencies situation. Incorporated in said letter was a table showing "Comparison of value of imports from countries which have discontinued using the gold standard with those from countries remaining on the gold standard, January to August, 1931 to 1932." This letter was filed in the recent hearings as an exhibit appended to the testimony of Mr. Dow.

To my mind, this is a very descriptive picture of the import situation affecting gold-standard countries, countries off the gold standard, and the other nations of the world. I insert it herewith.

Comparison of value of imports from countries which have discontinued using the gold standard with those from countries remaining on the gold standard, January to August, 1931 and 1932

	Total	Dutiable	Free
Actual value of imports taken as sample, January to August, 1931:			
20 countries off gold standard.....	\$661,036,708	\$145,522,167	\$515,514,541
11 countries on gold standard.....	276,906,254	154,031,961	122,874,293
Actual value of imports from remaining countries, including those imports from above 31 countries which were not taken as a sample.....	510,346,278	194,237,918	316,108,360
Total.....	1,448,289,240	493,792,046	954,497,194
Actual value of imports taken as sample, January to August, 1932:			
20 countries off gold standard.....	421,076,901	86,435,641	334,641,260
11 countries on gold standard.....	182,506,842	95,834,442	86,672,400
Actual value of imports from remaining countries, including those imports from above 31 countries which were not taken as a sample.....	313,717,213	113,624,570	200,092,643
Total.....	917,300,956	295,894,653	621,406,303
Percentage of decrease, January to August, 1931-32:			
20 countries off gold standard.....	36.3	40.6	35.1
11 countries on gold standard.....	34.1	37.8	29.5
Remaining countries.....	38.5	41.5	36.7
Total.....	36.7	40.1	34.9

Summing up, we are thoroughly convinced that the proponents of this measure have utterly failed to make their case.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, this extraordinary procedure on a discharge petition in the closing hours of this Congress in an attempt to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of H. R. 8557, the subject of which was being considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means in the ordinary way, is, in my judgment, nothing more nor less than a dying effort on the part of the outgoing administration to embarrass the incoming administration.

If we adopt this discharge rule, you might as well abolish the standing committees of the House. This bill was being considered in the ordinary way. Now we only have 10 minutes to consider one of the most important matters that has or will come before this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the contention before our subcommittee was to the effect that the imports from countries with a depreciated currency would deluge our country, whereas in 1932 the balance of trade was in our favor and our exports exceeded our imports by \$192,000,000.

If this policy is adopted and carried out, the inevitable result will be the loss of our foreign trade. Not only that, but we will get the ill will of all countries by this narrow, selfish policy.

This proposed legislation is nothing more nor less than an embargo. Another thing, it will greatly cripple American industry, American agriculture, and American labor. It is a narrow and selfish policy. We have already lost much of the friendship of other countries by the iniquitous Smoot-Hawley bill, and we hardly have a friend left in the world.

In 1932 the falling off in imports from countries with depreciated currencies was 6 per cent greater than for those countries on the gold standard. This is one of the most important questions that ever came before Congress, and this is a merely partisan effort or a partisan attempt in the last hours of the Congress to play cheap politics.

Every time the tariff subject is considered or mentioned the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] goes into paroxysms. He favors an embargo against the importation of all goods from all countries.

If we are being flooded or overrun with imports from countries with depreciated currencies, as contended, then those same countries are being deluged or trampled under foot by the exportation of goods from our country.

What is behind this unusual move on the part of the minority in the House? Did those responsible for the peti-

tion to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from further consideration of H. R. 8557, the Crowther bill, entertain the slightest hope that legislation of this character could possibly be enacted into law during the present session of Congress? They did not. It is nothing more nor less than the dying effort, conceived in narrow partisanship, of a discredited Republican administration to embarrass the incoming Democratic administration.

I say this is an unusual procedure, because the minority Members of this body, carrying out the orders of one of their masters, held a conference and agreed upon this program even before the Committee on Ways and Means had begun hearings on this far-reaching proposition, a proposal that is fraught with the gravest consequences not only to many of our own industries but to our international trade as well. Such action is a reflection on the Committee on Ways and Means, which in good faith was preparing to consider the proposed legislation in an orderly way and give it the consideration that such an important question warrants.

Whether the discharge rule is a wise one or not does not enter into the present discussion, but I want to say and warn the House that if such a move as this succeeds, we are establishing a dangerous precedent and we might as well abolish the standing committees of the House and legislate hereafter by petition.

What must Doctor CROWTHER, author of the bill that has been made the vehicle to get this matter before the House, think of this reflection on his well-known embargoism? Is it possible that his colleagues on the Republican side of the House have lost confidence in this high priest of protection and were mistakenly afraid that the evidence brought out in the hearings on this question would cause him to see the light and the inevitable blighting effect such legislation would have on our export trade and international relations?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON] was correct when he said that I voted against reporting out this bill (H. R. 8557) last year. At that time I believed, as many people believed, that the depreciated currencies in Europe would result, as usual, in a rise in prices and wages, so that there would be an equalization, ultimately, to compensate for the lower basis or standard of the circulating medium. However, that has not occurred, and there is no sign that it will occur, and I believe now that we should pass this legislation at once.

Mr. Speaker, in extending my remarks, let me add that one of the surprising developments of the present extended deviation from the gold standard of a large part of the civilized world is the continued maintenance of the same level of prices and wages that prevailed before this change occurred. That has resulted in a constantly growing advantage for sales in our markets to the producers of raw materials and the manufacturers of commodities in other countries whose costs of production were below ours even before their debased currencies gave them increased opportunities for successful competition with us. The danger of this competition is not lessened by comparatively diminished imports in some lines. The effect of those imports is to be measured, and has been vastly enlarged by the continued decrease of production and particularly of purchasing power in the United States. There are those who would counteract these effects by a debasement of our own currency. That would be a dangerous and ultimately ruinous stimulation, not a cure. Of course, a theoretical increase of prices, by a lowering of the standard—the American dollar—would not enhance values. It is like making a child believe that it is wealthier having 5 pennies than having only 1 nickel. Two 50-cent dollars are worth no more than one 100-cent dollar.

Mr. Speaker, instead of debasing our own currency, instead of competing with Europe in lowering our standard of

value, let us maintain our higher standard, let us preserve our domestic American markets for our workers, our own farmers, our own producers, our own capital, and our own labor. Therein lies our salvation.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, if by any method we could have included a preferential rate in this bill for mohair from Angora goats and rice from Arkansas, we would have had more favorable consideration of this bill from the Democratic side of the House, because I know that the distinguished Speaker of this House is a protectionist at heart. Of course he could not say anything about it in the last campaign. He did not go out with the show-boat troupe for fear that he might rock the boat.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] appears to be the spokesman for the opponents of this legislation. At least he acted in that capacity last Saturday. I have a very high regard for his intellectual attainments and legislative capability, but sometimes I fear, as I watch him in action, that he is misled and mistakes perspiration for inspiration. One wonders when he has time to think. My friend from Arkansas finds great solace and comfort in quoting the statements of Chairman O'Brien, of the Tariff Commission, against this policy. Even if the entire Democratic membership is so comforted it does not lessen the asininity of Mr. O'Brien's statements the fraction of a degree.

The gentleman from Arkansas says that we are placing a shroud on the poor old Republican Party. Oh, yes; the party is old, and just at present we are poor, but we are not yet ready for a shroud. There has been no count of 10 following the knockout blow in November last, and we are here ready to fight for the retention of the policy of a protective tariff as part of our national economic program. [Applause on Republican side.]

The theory advanced by the opponents of this bill is that American prices have been so reduced that an adjustment of tariff rates based on par value of foreign currencies would raise the rates to an unwarrantable degree. The Secretary of Commerce states that:

In no instance has the increase in foreign wholesale prices, in terms of foreign currency, been sufficient to offset the effects or depreciation in exchange, even making allowances for the decline of United States prices.

The Hawley-Smoot rates were written as competitive rates. They never were highly protective, and under existing conditions they are not now even competitive. No scaling ladders are necessary to get over our tariff wall. Depreciated currencies have opened the gates wide, and as a reception committee in the receiving line you find the Democrats and the importers and the international bankers all saying, "Welcome, little stranger," to the freight liners that bring in the commodities that ought to be now made by our own people in our own factories in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Depreciated currencies have brought about a condition in this country that the Democrats do not dare to try to develop by keeping their promises of reducing tariff rates which they made in the last campaign.

The gentleman from Arkansas said the other day that the Democrats won the campaign on the tariff issue. They never won a campaign in this country directly on the tariff issue. It was won by capitalizing the misery of the unemployed, by promising a job to 10,000,000 unemployed after March 4, by promising to repeal the eighteenth amendment, by promising to bring back beer and light wines immediately, and not on the tariff issue. If the campaign had been fought out solely on the tariff issue, the Democrats never would have reached first base.

The distinguished leader on the Democratic side [Mr. RAINEY] said on the floor of this House on January 9, 1932:

We do not want this country flooded with the products of cheap labor in other countries.

How will your action to-day square with that statement of his? My Democratic friends seem to have lost interest in American workmen. Any reference to the policy of protec-

tion to American industry and labor is studiously avoided in the Democratic platform. "A competitive tariff for revenue" is your declaration. "Avaunt protection! and quit our sight" is the entrance cue for the "new deal."

It is the same old Democratic Party, gentlemen, demagoguing its way through the pages of history, forever carrying water in a sieve, always rolling a stone uphill, always disappointed in its hopes, because it has not the integrity to be honest with itself nor the capacity to keep faith with the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8557?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 174, nays 212, answered "present" 2, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

YEAS—174

Adkins	Crall	Jenkins	Sanders, N. Y.
Aldrich	Crowther	Johnson, Wash.	Schafer
Allen	Culkin	Kading	Seger
Andresen	Curry	Kahn	Selvig
Andrew, Mass.	Darrow	Kelly, Pa.	Shott
Andrews, N. Y.	Davis, Pa.	Ketcham	Simmons
Arentz	De Priest	Kinzer	Sinclair
Bacharach	Doutrich	Knutson	Snell
Bachmann	Dowell	Kopp	Snow
Bacon	Dyer	Kurtz	Stalker
Baldrige	Eaton, Colo.	Lankford, Va.	Stokes
Barbour	Eaton, N. J.	Leavitt	Strong, Kans.
Beck	Englebright	Lehlbach	Strong, Pa.
Beedy	Erk	Loofbourov	Stull
Biddle	Estep	Lovette	Summers, Wash.
Bohn	Evans, Calif.	Luce	Swanson
Boileau	Foss	McClintock, Ohio	Swick
Bolton	Frear	McFadden	Swing
Bowman	Free	McLeod	Taber
Brand, Ohio	Freeman	Maas	Taylor, Tenn.
Britten	French	Manlove	Temple
Buckbee	Garber	Mapes	Thatcher
Burdick	Gibson	Martin, Mass.	Thurston
Burtess	Gifford	Martin, Oreg.	Timberlake
Cable	Goodwin	Michener	Turpin
Campbell, Iowa	Goss	Millard	Underhill
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	Moore, Ohio	Watson
Carter, Calif.	Hall, Ill.	Mouser	Watson
Carter, Wyo.	Hall, N. Dak.	Murphy	Weeks
Cavichia	Hancock, N. Y.	Nelson, Me.	Welch
Chindblom	Hardy	Niedringhaus	White
Chiperfield	Hartley	Nolan	Whitley
Christopherson	Hess	Parker, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Clague	Hill, Wash.	Partridge	Williamson
Clancy	Hogg, Ind.	Perkins	Withrow
Clarke, N. Y.	Hogg, W. Va.	Pittenger	Wolcott
Cochran, Pa.	Holaday	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Wolfenden
Cole, Iowa	Hollister	Purnell	Wolverton
Colton	Holmes	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Connery	Hooper	Ransley	Woodruff
Connolly	Horr	Reed, N. Y.	Wyant
Cooke	Houston, Del.	Rich	Yates
Cooper, Ohio	Hull, William E.	Robinson	
Coyle	James	Rogers, Mass.	

NAYS—212

Abernethy	Chavez	Eslick	Hull, Morton D.
Allgood	Christgau	Evans, Mont.	Jacobsen
Almon	Clark, N. C.	Fernandez	Jeffers
Amle	Cochran, Mo.	Fiesinger	Johnson, Mo.
Arnold	Cole, Md.	Fishburne	Johnson, Okla.
Auf der Heide	Collier	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Tex.
Ayres	Collins	Flannagan	Jones
Barton	Condon	Fulbright	Keller
Beam	Cooper, Tenn.	Fuller	Kelly, Ill.
Black	Corning	Fulmer	Kemp
Bland	Cox	Gambrill	Kennedy, Md.
Blanton	Cross	Gavagan	Kennedy, N. Y.
Bloom	Crowe	Gilchrist	Kerr
Boehne	Crump	Gillen	Kleberg
Boland	Cullen	Glover	Kniffin
Boylan	Davis, Tenn.	Goldsborough	Kunz
Briggs	Delaney	Granfield	Kvale
Browning	DeRouen	Greenwood	LaGuardia
Brunner	Dickinson	Gregory	Lambertson
Buchanan	Dickstein	Griffin	Lambeth
Bulwinkle	Dies	Griswold	Lamneck
Burch	Dieterich	Guy	Lanham
Busby	Disney	Haines	Lankford, Ga.
Byrns	Dominick	Hare	Larrabee
Canfield	Douglas, Ariz.	Harlan	Lea
Cannon	Douglass, Mass.	Hart	Lewis
Carden	Doxey	Hastings	Lichtenwalner
Carley	Drane	Hill, Ala.	Lindsay
Cary	Drewry	Hoch	Loneragan
Castellow	Driver	Hope	Lozier
Celler	Eagle	Howard	Ludlow
Chapman	Ellzey	Huddleston	McClintic, Okla.

McCormack	Norton, N. J.	Reilly	Sutphin
McDuffie	O'Connor	Rogers, N. H.	Swank
McGugin	Oliver, Ala.	Romjue	Tarver
McKeown	Oliver, N. Y.	Rudd	Taylor, Colo.
McMillan	Owen	Sabath	Thomason
McReynolds	Palmisano	Sanders, Tex.	Tierney
McSwain	Parker, Ga.	Sandlin	Underwood
Major	Parks	Schneider	Vinson, Ga.
Mansfield	Parsons	Schuetz	Vinson, Ky.
May	Patman	Shallenberger	Warren
Mead	Patterson	Sirovich	Weaver
Miller	Peavey	Smith, Va.	West
Milligan	Pettengill	Smith, W. Va.	Whittington
Mitchell	Polk	Sparks	Williams, Mo.
Mobley	Pou	Spence	Williams, Tex.
Montet	Prall	Stafford	Wilson
Moore, Ky.	Ragon	Steagall	Wingo
Morehead	Rainey	Stevenson	Wood, Ga.
Nelson, Mo.	Ramspeck	Stewart	Woodrum
Nelson, Wis.	Rankin	Sullivan, N. Y.	Wright
Norton, Nebr.	Rayburn	Summers, Tex.	Yon

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Crosser	Doughton
---------	----------

NOT VOTING—39

Bankhead	Gilbert	Johnson, Ill.	Seiberling
Brand, Ga.	Golder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Shannon
Brumm	Green	Larsen	Shreve
Cartwright	Hall, Miss.	Magrady	Smith, Idaho
Chase	Hancock, N. C.	Maloney	Somers, N. Y.
Davenport	Haugen	Montague	Sullivan, Pa.
Finley	Hawley	Overton	Sweeney
Fish	Hopkins	Person	Tinkham
Flood	Hornor	Pratt, Ruth	Treadway
Gasque	Igoe	Reid, Ill.	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hawley (for) with Mr. Doughton (against).
 Mr. Seiberling (for) with Mr. Crosser (against).
 Mr. Magrady (for) with Mr. Brand of Georgia (against).
 Mr. Hopkins (for) with Mr. Shannon (against).
 Mr. Fish (for) with Mr. Green (against).
 Mr. Shreve (for) with Mr. Cartwright (against).
 Mr. Reid of Illinois (for) with Mr. Maloney (against).
 Mr. Treadway (for) with Mr. Montague (against).
 Mrs. Pratt (for) with Mr. Bankhead (against).
 Mr. Smith of Idaho (for) with Mr. Igoe (against).
 Mr. Golder (for) with Mr. Larsen (against).
 Mr. Haugen (for) with Mr. Hornor (against).
 Mr. Davenport (for) with Mr. Hancock of North Carolina (against).
 Mr. Person (for) with Mr. Gasque (against).
 Mr. Brumm (for) with Mr. Sweeney (against).
 Mr. Johnson of South Dakota (for) with Mr. Overton (against).
 Mr. Tinkham (for) with Mr. Somers of New York (against).
 Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania (for) with Mr. Flood (against).
 Mr. Finley (for) with Mr. Gilbert (against).
 Mr. Chase (for) with Mr. Hall of Mississippi (against).

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the gentleman from Florida, Mr. GREEN, is unavoidably detained on account of illness in his family. If present, he would vote "no."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SEIBERLING; but if I were permitted to vote I would vote "no."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. HAWLEY. If present, the gentleman from Oregon would vote "aye," and if I were permitted to vote I would vote "no."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. REID, is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "aye."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. SMITH, is detained from the Chamber on account of illness. If present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion by Mr. COLLIER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected was laid on the table.

EQUALIZATION OF TARIFF DUTIES—EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this measure has to do with one of the most serious obstacles to world recovery. The abandonment of the world's common standard of value by some thirty-odd countries has brought a factor of uncertainty and instability into all international trade. But worse than that the depreciation of foreign currencies has cut us off from many profitable foreign markets for our

raw materials and manufactures. As the gold exchange value of their currencies has declined, foreign prices translated into gold have declined and the profit of our export trade has been wiped out. In consequence, our exports have diminished and the unemployment situation in this country has grown steadily worse. There is no legislation that we can adopt which will remedy this curtailment of our foreign market.

But an even more disastrous consequence of the foreign currency situation has befallen us in our own markets, where products of foreign origin are enabled to be sold at greatly reduced prices, without reducing the profits of foreign competitors in terms of their local currencies. This situation, which is driving many American undertakings to the wall, and depriving hundreds of thousands of our people of their usual means of livelihood, can be remedied by such legislation as is proposed in the Crowther and Hill bills, and we shall be negligent of our trust as representatives of the American people, if we refuse to consider it.

There can be no question that in many lines of industry, every vestige of protection hitherto provided by the Congress has been more than offset by this plague of depreciating exchange. In Japan the currency has depreciated by nearly 60 per cent, in England by 30 per cent, in the Scandinavian countries by similar percentages. This means that whatever protective tariffs we have established have been rendered wholly ineffective, and that the products of these countries can be dumped in our market at prices reduced by a third or a half below their former level, and yet their sale yields the foreign producers the same profits as before.

I want to speak particularly of the fishing industry, of which I can speak from personal knowledge, as the majority of the people in the community where I live have for three centuries drawn their living from the sea. At first glance it may seem strange, but it is none the less true, that the fishermen of New England find themselves to-day in dire straits because of the falling value of the yen in Japan, the krone in Norway, and the pound in Great Britain.

The New England fishermen have been hard hit by this situation. It has made it possible for Japanese swordfish to be frozen and shipped across the Pacific, through the canal, and landed in Boston at far less than half the normal American market price. The Gloucester sword fishermen have thus been practically driven out of business by the fall of the Japanese yen. Similarly, boneless codfish packed in Japan is being sold throughout the Middle West at little more than half its cost of production in Gloucester. Despite a protective tariff, kippered herring from England is being sold in our own market at less than the Gloucester cost of production. Likewise sardines from Norway and Portugal are driving the Maine canneries to the wall. In a word, because of depreciated currency abroad, our fishing industry to-day is far worse off than it would be if we were operating under free trade under normal currency conditions. What is true of the fishing industry is true of many other of our New England industries, notably the manufacture of cutlery, rubber footwear, wood pulp, electric-light bulbs, and many of our textiles.

While we can not protect our export trade against the declining profit due to foreign depreciation, we can do something to protect our domestic market from abnormal competition due to this cause. The Hill bill and the Crowther bill point the way. They do not seek to increase tariff duties but to prevent these duties from being completely wiped out in a moment when our own people particularly need and are entitled to see them maintained. The element of time is of the highest importance. Every week that we delay sees American industries driven out of existence and American workmen forced into the ranks of the unemployed for the sole benefit of foreign competitors. The party that assumes the responsibility of delaying or estopping the consideration of these measures at this time must bear a heavy load of blame. For it evidences its willingness to sacrifice the people of the United States for the advantage of those of Great Britain and the countries of continental Europe and the Orient in one of the gravest periods of our history.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, I desire to offer a few observations on depreciated currency, and its effect on the tariff. There has recently been brought to my attention a statement by Mr. Fred H. Sexauer, president of the Dairyman's League Cooperative Association, relative to depreciated currency and the effect on butter prices in the United States, which appeared in the January edition of the Creamery Journal, part of which I quote as follows:

So long as England and other European countries remain on a monetary system wherein their money unit comparable to the American dollar is of lower gold value than that of the United States, butter can not attain a price much higher than 25 cents on the New York market. * * *

Just why the English monetary system, which at present values gold on a ratio of about 14 grains to \$1, as against the United States 23.22 grains per dollar, should so affect butter prices in this country may not be evident to the casual observer. However, it was well illustrated just recently when it checked an upward movement of butter prices and broke the market. * * *

A situation existed that was promising for the dairy industry. Suddenly the upward movement was checked and prices broke. New Zealand butter, which had not been entering the United States, was suddenly able to jump the 14-cent tariff wall and come into competition with the domestic product. The New Zealand butter shipper, who had been selling in England at about 19 cents on the English money basis, equal to 12 cents on the United States gold basis, found it more profitable to ship to this country despite the tariff. * * *

In other words, because of the difference in quantity of gold between the present monetary systems of England and the United States, the country's dollar increases in value to about \$1.47 when converted into English money. Thus New Zealand was able to sell butter on the Pacific coast at a price that paid the tariff, covered shipping, and left a larger profit than if the product had been shipped to England. * * *

This entry of New Zealand butter quickly broke the market for domestic butter. It is evident that so long as the gold value of England's money and that of the United States continue at the present wide difference butter prices can not advance here. Anytime such prices do increase the New Zealand product will again be attracted.

The letter of transmittal also has the following statement:

In order to bring agriculture back to a pre-war basis it will become necessary for us to do something to adjust the value of money. This article shows that even with a 14-cent tariff on butter, it is not working at the present time, because of the variation in valuation of money between the different countries. * * *

The depreciated currency of the 28 nations that have gone off the gold standard has had a most damaging effect on American industries. It has enabled the competitors to buy on the world market, paying for the commodities with depreciated currency of less than two-thirds the value of the United States currency based on gold. The foreign depreciated dollar, which at present values gold on a ratio of about 14 grains to \$1, as against the United States 23.22 grains per dollar fine gold (25.8 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine), has enabled the importer to exchange two American dollars for better than three depreciated dollars, and to buy three times as much butter than if payment of our standard dollar were required, and thus enables him, as stated, to jump over the 14-cent tariff wall and come into competition with our domestic product. Hence, it has not only destroyed the value of European currency but the price of their commodities as well. The depreciation by more than one-third in the value of the currency, as pointed out by Mr. Sexauer, has enabled the importer to jump the 14-cent tariff wall, thus lowering the price of butter, as well as other commodities, to the extent of one-third the value of the dollar. Not only that but it has demonstrated the value of the protective tariff to American industry. At present, with depreciated currency, the tariff is ineffective to the extent of the difference between 19 cents English currency and 12 cents in United States currency, or 7 cents a pound. It is needless to say, if—as stated by Mr. Sexauer, New Zealand butter can come into our markets and sell in competition with domestic products, even after paying 14-cent tariff—if it were not for the 14-cent tariff, it could be laid down in New York at 14 cents less than the price of 19 cents in European currency, equal to 12 cents in United States currency, plus 1½ cents freight, net 13½ cents f. o. b. New York, instead of, as stated by Mr. Sexauer, the price now being 19 cents

European currency, equal to 12 cents American currency plus 14 cents tariff, or 26 cents. In other words, it would reduce the current price of butter approximately one-half.

By all means legislation should at least be enacted to collect the difference at the customhouse as a surtax or countervailing tax on the imports of the difference between the par value and the depreciated value on the day of entry, rather than chop off one-third or more of the standard gold dollar, which would give us more dollars, but unfortunately of more than one-third less value, and as a result the many millions of dollars payable in gold, which would unless one-third or more of the obligation is to be discounted, it would require more than \$3 to discharge the obligation of \$2. According to world quotations foreign and domestic producers operating under depreciated currency receive no more dollars than do domestic producers, as stated by Mr. Sexauer, "New Zealand butter selling in England at about 19 cents in English money, equal to 12 cents in United States," as compared with from 17 cents to 23 cents during the last few months here at the creameries, or as stated by Mr. Sexauer, "at the top price of 26 cents in New York."

Producers of wheat in Canada sell their wheat, much of it, at 10 cents a bushel less than producers on the American side. The Canadian dollar of to-day is quoted at 84.2045. This matter was brought vividly to my attention last October when disposing of 47 bushels of wheat grown in North Dakota, only a few miles this side of the Canadian line, which sold at 42½ cents, or \$19.97. According to quotations in the Chicago Daily Tribune on October 1, 1932, the price on the Canadian side was a trifle above 29 cents. Over there my 47 bushels of wheat would have brought only \$13.63, less Canadian exchange of \$1.36, net \$12.23, or \$7.77 less than the amount, or approximately 16½ cents a bushel less than what I received on the American side. In paying my taxes in Canada, amounting to \$57.15 on a piece of land, I paid by draft of \$52.72. On these small transactions my gain in selling on the American side on the wheat was \$7.77, and my gain in paying taxes in Canada with American currency was \$4.53.

Mexico is on the silver basis. Its dollars are worth only one-half as much as ours. A recent foreign exchange quotes it at 28.5833. I recall many years ago exchanging \$100 in American currency and receiving \$404 in Mexican dollars, and dollars containing more silver than ours.

Considering quotations and experience in foreign countries with depreciated currency, although the cheap dollar might discharge obligations not payable in gold and buy as much of the commodities as our good dollars, it seems to me that to permit the payment for agricultural commodities or the payment of debts by cheap dollars is on the border line of repudiation.

Section 311 of the Code of Laws of the United States provides for the continuance of the parity in value of the coins of gold and silver and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the market and in the payment of debts. Section 314 provides that the standard dollar, consisting of 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, shall be the standard unit of value and all forms of money issued or coined by the United States shall be maintained at a parity of value with this standard, and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain such parity. Section 408 provides that the United States notes, Treasury notes, and so forth, when presented to the Treasurer for redemption shall be redeemed in gold coin of the standard fixed.

The question is, Can the suggested dollar of 14 ounces of gold be made to equal the value of the one containing 25.8 grains of gold nine-tenths fine, and be made of equal power in the payment of debts without impairing existing contracts? The Constitution provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and the fifth amendment provides that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.

Can Congress cut off one-third of the gold of the present gold dollar and declare it to be on a parity and of equal value with the former dollar containing one-third more gold with impunity?

I can not become reconciled to the fact that if I borrowed from my neighbor 100 bushels of wheat of 60 pounds to the bushel, or 6,000 pounds, that by Congress changing the standard to 40 pounds to the bushel, that I would be discharging my obligation to my neighbor by tendering to him 4,000 pounds. Or if I borrowed \$100 based on 23.22 grains of gold, that by Congress changing the standard to 14 grains that I would be discharging my obligation by tendering \$100 containing one-third less gold. One thing I do know—were I permitted to melt \$100 gold containing 23.22 grains of gold to the dollar and run it through the mint I would be approximately \$35 ahead or long on gold, and my neighbor would be just that much short.

One thing is certain, that in the absence of a protective tariff to protect American industry and labor against importation of foreign products, it would place the American producer and labor on a level with foreign labor and producers. Considering it all, it seems to me that rather than to substitute cheap dollars for good dollars, the better way out of the difficulty would be to require the collection of the difference at the customhouse as a surtax, or as a countervailing tax on the imports of the difference between the value of our dollar and the depreciated value of the depreciated currency, or to raise the tariff or, if need be, set up an embargo.

Fortunately, we are and have been enjoying the highest standard of living in the world. Personally, I believe in maintaining it. One way of maintaining our high standard of living is by protecting our markets from flooding by products produced at a lower cost and under lower standards of living. In my opinion, the practical way of maintaining our high standard of living and high wages is to insure employment and protection to American labor and American producers and every worthy and legitimate enterprise against the importation of products produced by underpaid labor under lower standards of living—in short, a tariff for the common good of all American people.

However, bearing in mind that in the case of a surplus in excess of the domestic requirements the tariff is ineffective and the price obtained for the surplus on the world market establishes the price of the whole production. It is needless to say that the tariff, by all means, must be also made effective. For example, notwithstanding the tariff already fixed by the Tariff Commission is 14 cents on butter, as stated by Mr. Sexauer, butter is still being imported. The Hawley-Smoot bill increased the tariff on livestock of less than 700 pounds from 1½ cents to 2½ cents; over 700 pounds, from 2 to 3 cents; beef was increased from 3 to 6 cents; swine was increased from ½ cent to 2 cents; hams and bacon and shoulders were increased from 2 to 3½ cents; milk from 2½ cents to 5½ cents per gallon, and cream was increased from 20 cents to 56.06 cents per gallon.

Cattle are coming across the Canadian line in large numbers, and Canadian hams and bacon, advertised as such, are now served at medium-class restaurants in Washington. Certainly the Iowa farmer, tilling his farm valued at many times the price of foreign highly productive soil, and paying high wages, can not compete with products produced by underpaid foreign labor on lower-priced land equal in productivity, much of it selling at one-quarter to one-tenth of the American price, nor can the American wage earner, receiving the highest wage in the world, measured by the purchasing power of from two to six times more than those of the European countries, compete with foreign labor, nor can the American farmer, with existing disparity in prices of agricultural commodities, employ labor at an American wage, pay taxes and debts, even with deflated currency, nor can it, under the present conditions, be done even by cutting the interest rate in two. As everybody knows, there are millions of farmers at present who are unable to pay their taxes, much less interest, even though the rate be lowered. Certainly it can not be done by lowering their prices and standard of living to that of Russia and other nations' with lower prices and standards of living.

My contention has been, and I still adhere to it, that the most effective way of starting not only the farmer, but labor

and every worthy and legitimate industry back on the highway of prosperity, is to first protect American industry and labor against the importation of foreign products, made at lower cost and under lower standards of living, by a tariff; and second, by making that tariff effective so as to establish and maintain advantageous domestic markets, as provided in the McNary-Haugen bill, passed two times by the Senate and House, or if the tariff is not made the yardstick, the ratio price, a ratio price equivalent to the pre-war prices for the years 1905 to 1914, or as suggested by some, the cost price plus a reasonable profit would afford well-deserved relief. In other words, to rehabilitate agriculture, through the redemption of the often repeated party platform pledges to restore equality between agriculture, labor, and industry. If so, we shall have restored confidence in men and party platform pledges.

Then, and not until then, will hunger, privation, and agony, and the heart-rending worry over the loss of the old homestead, so near and dear to young and old, the closing of banks, the receivership of railroads and long-established worthy and legitimate enterprises, and the deflation process and demand for depreciated currency be stopped.

Mother Earth is the producer of new wealth. The only way I know of creating new wealth is through the application of energy and labor to bring forth the treasures of Mother Earth. The farmer by his labor affords the opportunity for the sun, rain, and soil to bring into existence the essentials of life—the food we eat and the clothes we wear. With railroads rusting from idleness, factories and mills crumbling, and millions of men and women out of employment, it must be clear to all with absolute finality that the stability, growth, and greatness of our Nation depend upon the prosperity of the tillers of the soil.

It is needless to say that if the party platform pledges are redeemed, and when the existing disparity is overcome and parity is restored, there will be no need for 50 or 60 cent dollars; if so, tax receipts will be substituted for tax deeds, satisfaction of mortgages will be recorded in place of sheriff's deeds, pay checks will be substituted for meal tickets, rent receipts will take the place of eviction notices, teachers will be the proud possessors of certified checks instead of warrants indorsed "refused on account of no funds;" ministers' salaries will be paid in currency instead of in promises, banks will honor checks presented, merchants will receive orders for and payment for goods, and although late, better late than never; tranquillity, cheer, happiness, and jollification meetings will take the place of sheriff's sales and protest meetings, farmers' and laborers' strikes, evictions, bread lines, and the call for charity.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions prior to and since the election I have expressed the judgment that tariff duties should be levied on imports into our country to offset whatever advantages a depreciated currency may give to industry in countries that have gone off the gold standard.

In the recent Democratic House caucus held for the purpose of considering my party's attitude regarding the Crowther bill, designed to increase existing tariff rates on articles imported into this country from countries having a depreciated currency, and also to levy a tariff duty on articles now on the free list imported from such countries, I asked for and got permission from the caucus to differ from the majority of my colleagues in the House and to vote in favor of the consideration of the Crowther bill when it should come before the House on the petition to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill, in the event my study of the bill and the hearings should justify me in so voting.

As a result of my study of the Crowther bill and the hearings on the bill, I have come to the conclusion that the bill should not be approved by the House.

The Crowther bill provides for the levying of additional tariff duties on articles imported into our country from countries having a depreciated currency of more than 5 per cent, the tariff duties to be equal to the percentage of depreciation of the currency in the exporting countries.

This bill also provides for the levying of similar tariff duties on articles now on the free list imported from countries having a depreciated currency.

On the hearing on the Crowther bill before the Ways and Means Committee, three members of the Tariff Commission, including Mr. O'Brien, the chairman of the commission and a high-tariff Republican, appeared and opposed its passage.

Mr. O'Brien testified that our imports to-day are at a very low ebb, both in quantity and price; that there is still a very heavy balance of trade in our favor, both in quantity and value. All the members of the Tariff Commission testified that there was no flooding of our market from countries operating under a depreciated currency, and that a depreciated currency gave no advantage to the industries in countries off the gold standard as regards their exports into our country, except a temporary advantage that speedily adjusts itself.

Last October President Hoover ordered the Tariff Commission to investigate the matter of increased importations into our country from countries off the gold standard.

The Tariff Commission reports that imports to our country are falling off; that the imports during the fiscal year 1932 from countries off the gold standard decreased in a greater percentage than the imports into our country, during the same period, from countries on the gold standard.

One of the functions of the Tariff Commission is to investigate trade conditions for the purpose of recommending to the President changes in tariff rates when in the judgment of the commission such changes are necessary.

Since last October the commission has been investigating the question of an effect of depreciated currency on imports into our country, and only recently the commission ordered an increase of tariff duties on rubber goods coming from countries on and off the gold standard. The commission is still at work on this line of investigation.

Doctor Durand, chief economist of the Tariff Commission, says that the Crowther bill would raise a tariff embargo in our country against all the world.

Sixty-seven per cent of our imports are now on the free list. The passage of the Crowther bill would put thousands of these articles on the dutiable list and would raise our tariff wall from about an average rate of 16 per cent to more than double that rate.

I can not vote for the consideration of this bill for the reason that I must take the findings and judgment of the Tariff Commission as to the wisdom and necessity of such legislation, and for the further reason that I am not willing to attempt to frame on the floor of this House a tariff bill automatic in its operations, that would result in tariff rates, that would put the rates of the Hawley-Smoot bill to shame.

The passage of this bill would result in our country levying different tariff rates on the same article exported from different countries, a situation that might lead to international misunderstandings, and to feeling on the part of some countries that we were discriminating against them through the levying of tariff duties.

France a few years ago depreciated her franc 80 per cent. France to-day is on the gold standard and her exports to our country under the pending bill would not be subject to any raise in tariff duties, while England and Canada, two of our best customers, would have to pay higher duties.

The pending bill is an unscientific and unworkable measure, designed to fix tariff rates without any regard to the cost of production, the only scientific basis upon which to write a tariff bill.

Again, from the testimony of the Tariff Commissioners, it would appear that our industries, if they are threatened to-day with disastrous foreign competition, that threat is just as great, if not greater, from countries operating on the gold standard as from countries having a depreciated currency, yet this bill would give no relief from imports coming from countries on the gold standard.

Many communications have come to my desk regarding the pending bill, particularly as its terms would affect wood pulp. About half of these communications declare that if a tariff is not placed on wood pulp the wood-pulp plants will

have to close, and the other half insist that if a tariff is placed on wood pulp the paper mills will have to close.

Such advice, to say the least, is confusing to a lawmaker, and as a result I feel obligated to follow the judgment of the Tariff Commission.

It is possible that because of changing economic conditions at home and abroad, it may become necessary to levy higher tariff duties on articles now dutiable, and to levy new duties on articles now on the free list, but Congress is in no position to enter upon such tariff changes until it has the information upon which to base such legislation, and that information should come from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion to discharge the Ways and Means Committee from the consideration of H. R. 8557, known as the Crowther bill. I do not favor exercising the harsh discharge rule except in extreme cases. I certainly am opposed to its exercise in this case.

I feel that the Ways and Means Committee should be allowed to make a most exhaustive study of this bill and its far-reaching provisions. In fact, I am opposed to the bill in its present form. I feel that this entire matter should be worked out by a bill dealing with the tariff in its entirety.

To my mind this bill if enacted into law would not help our people as a whole. It is not such a bill as should be passed under whip and spur and without the most careful consideration.

I would much prefer to pass at once a bill to inflate our own currency, both in volume and amount, to offset the effect of the inflation of currency in other countries instead of attempting to get this result by the passage of the Crowther bill.

I can not at all subscribe to the proposition that either the present bill or a general tariff bill or any other similar measure will bring back real permanent prosperity until there is a proper inflation of the circulation of our currency both in volume and amount. This accompanied by a proper adjustment of the indebtedness of our people and a real farm-relief program will usher in real and permanent prosperity.

Let us remove the causes of the depression and the effects will improve. All the bad effects of the depression, though, can never be fully overcome any more than all who die in an epidemic of physical disease can be brought back to life. This is why I have been so anxious all these months and years for Congress to pass some legislation to stop loan foreclosures, help our farmers get better prices, save the homes of our people, and give them another chance in life's battle.

UNITED STATES GEORGIA BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 518) establishing the United States Georgia Bicentennial Commission, and for other purposes, and I ask that the Clerk may read the joint resolution for information.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 518

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the United States Georgia Bicentennial Commission, for the purpose of participation by the United States in the observance of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Georgia Colony, such commission to be composed of 21 commissioners, as follows: Nine persons to be appointed by the President of the United States; 6 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation, and shall select a chairman from among their number.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the commission established by this resolution for actual and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while discharging its official duties outside the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out section 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PURNELL. Reserving the right to object, I wish to get some information about this. Is the gentleman asking unanimous consent to pass the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I want to get a little information in regard to the resolution. I am not sure whether I shall object to it or not. I want to make my position clear to the House. I have at all times opposed legislation of this character, and it does seem to me that to bring up a resolution establishing a commission of 21 members to prepare for a celebration down in Georgia at this time is a needless expense to the Government. If there is not to be any expense connected with this, why is it to be done under the authority of the United States commission? We have been through this several times. The same statement has been made on the floor of the House that "We want the Government to take supervision of this, give its name and influence to it, but we are not going to ask for any appropriation." That has been done time and time again, but after we have assumed responsibility for it, then the people who are connected with the celebration come here and ask the Government to appropriate money. They say, "The Government must do this. The Government has assumed responsibility, and they must make some appropriation to carry out that work." I think the Speaker of the House has always taken the same position on this proposition that I have. I dislike to object to the resolution offered by the gentleman or the consideration of it, but I want it definitely known that this is no time to start any new celebrations at the expense of the American people. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Will the House permit the Chair to make a statement? The Chair has taken this matter up with the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from New York has stated the position of the Chair exactly. Two or three gentlemen from Georgia, however, have stated they would not ask for any additional appropriation aside from the \$1,000 contained in the resolution passed by the Senate, and that the celebration is to end next September. Those gentlemen have given assurance that they will not ask for any additional appropriation. They are Members of this Congress, and they are Members of the next Congress. Taking that for granted, the Chair thought he could recognize them under the circumstances just stated.

Mr. PURNELL. Reserving the right to object, as I remember the statement made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] before the Committee on Rules, even the sum of \$1,000 was not to be requested.

Mr. COX. The Committee on Rules struck out section 2, which carried an appropriation of \$5,000.

Mr. PURNELL. So that as the resolution is now before the House, it carries no appropriation?

Mr. COX. The Senate had previously passed Senate Joint Resolution 223, which carried an appropriation of \$1,000. I did state to the Rules Committee that the Georgia delegation would not ask for any appropriation whatsoever. I can appreciate the fact that the objection to resolutions of this character is that they usually call for money out of the Public Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is it the purpose of the gentleman from Georgia to ask unanimous consent to consider the Senate resolution, if permission is granted to consider the resolution at all?

Mr. COX. I intended to ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 223 be substituted for House Joint Resolution 518, with the understanding that section 2 would be stricken out.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I want a little further information. I appreciate what the gentleman has said and I have no doubt he does not intend to ask for any appropriation, but I know what the pressure will be on the Georgia delegation by the people back home as soon as this is adopted to get some appropriation from the Congress to meet the expenses.

Who is going to pay the expenses of this commission of 21 members?

Mr. COX. If there is any participation the commission will have to pay its own expenses. I may say in answer to the gentleman's inquiry that I know a majority of the House delegation have stated they would not ask for any appropriation whatsoever. Speaking for myself, I shall oppose any effort to get any appropriation of any character in connection with this commission.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman give us that assurance on behalf of the Georgia delegation in the next session of Congress?

Mr. COX. I am sure I can.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is speaking for this member of the Georgia delegation also.

Mr. SNELL. If I have correctly stated the understanding, I shall not object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the understanding, that the commission will not ask for any appropriation.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am the author of this resolution. No Member from Georgia will ask for any appropriation, either of this Congress or the next.

Mr. PURNELL. And I may add further, no opposition was voiced to the resolution in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COX. That is very correct.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact this resolution apparently complies with the Democratic program in reference to expenditures for funerals and commissions, I do not think there should be objection to this resolution.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from New York is needlessly disturbed about this, because a similar commission participated in the celebration of the Battle of Bennington; and although the resolution provided for the expenses of the commission, the members of the commission paid their own expenses.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York has had considerable experience in seeing such commissions started, and I think he knows what he is talking about.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute a similar Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 223), with the understanding that section 2 thereof will be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the United States Georgia bicentennial commission, for the purpose of participation by the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Georgia colony, such commission to be composed of 21 commissioners as follows: Nine persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 6 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the commission established by this resolution for actual and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while discharging its official duties outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: On page 2, line 4, strike out all of section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the discharge motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may we be informed what business will be considered during the balance of the day?

The SPEAKER. This is District day. District bills will be considered as long as the House desires to consider them.

LINCOLN AND DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is the day the Nation is celebrating the birthday of a great American. I think the House of Representatives should make some recognition of the fact. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes on the life and public service of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECK. Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to the courtesy of the House for this opportunity to make a brief and inadequate reference to the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of the birth of Lincoln. Time would not permit me, and in any event it would be unnecessary, to summarize his life from its cradle in a Kentucky log cabin to its Calvary in Ford's Theater.

When the French people sepulchred their greatest warrior and ruler in his tomb in the Invalides, it was their fine conception that Napoleon's fame was so universal and permanent that it was not necessary to inscribe his name upon his porphyry tomb. Similarly, it did not require a Greek temple and a Jove-like bronze effigy to perpetuate the timeless fame of Lincoln, for his true monument is in the hearts of the plain people of all nations.

My only purpose is to make some observations that may be pertinent to the present critical hour, which have been suggested by the life of Lincoln. His career should have an especial interest for this body, for he was once a Member of this House, and it may be some comfort to those of us who, in moments of disillusion, feel that our labors are so largely futile, to realize that the career of Lincoln in the House of Representatives seemed also to him wholly futile. Indeed, it may be of some comfort to many of our colleagues, whose smiling faces we shall greatly but temporarily miss after March 4, that Lincoln, too, was once a "lame duck," and then regarded his political career as definitely ended. Let us hope that, among those whom a misguided people have temporarily furloughed, some, like Lincoln, will return to Washington to accept even greater official responsibilities.

I am greatly complimented by the fact that our colleague, and my greatly valued friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], paid me the compliment of asking the House to give its consent to this address.

I mention this not merely to acknowledge a gracious compliment paid to me by a colleague on the other side of the aisle but because this courtesy is symptomatic of a present condition in American politics, which in a time of stress and anxiety should give us encouragement as to the future of democratic institutions.

No nation can be a true democracy, however wise its form of government, unless its people are inspired by a kindly tolerance of differences of opinion. It was for this reason that Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned all succeeding generations against the excesses of partisan strife.

There is no more striking an illustration of this fact than is now observable in Germany, where one of the most finely educated people in the world find it impossible to make democratic institutions function because of the bitter rancor between men of opposite political faiths. Next March Germany will have had its fifth nation-wide election within 12

months, and each one has been accompanied by general and continuous disorder and much bloodshed.

Contrast this with the moving spectacle of our people, who, after a presidential campaign of unequaled intensity and in a period when the very sufferings of men might have produced violence, yet went to the polls last November in peace and quiet, and when the vote was counted men of both parties acquiesced in the result. Victors and vanquished united in a common feeling of good will for the historic party that is soon to assume the reins of power.

It was not always so. Prior to the Civil War there was the same intensity between the political parties as is now observable in Germany, and in three different crises the Union was on the point of disintegration. The same spirit of personal animosity was observable in the Congress, and the aisle of the Senate was not infrequently the pathway to the dueling field. It was natural that this spirit of feverish partisanship and intense antagonism continued for nearly two decades after the Civil War, during the dark and tragic days of reconstruction—a deplorable period which might never have been if Abraham Lincoln had lived.

As a native Philadelphian I take some pride in the fact that this most tragic period of our history ended when North and South met in Philadelphia to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Thus, meeting in May, 1876, in a lovely park, whose vernal flowers made it a new and noble field of the cloth of gold, North and South clasped hands in—as we fondly hope—a lasting amity. Since then, notwithstanding the acute differences of opinion between the two great political parties, there has been nothing but good will between them and a common and dominant desire to serve the Republic which we all love so well.

I can not but think that this is due in no small part to the influence of Abraham Lincoln. When the war was nearly ended, Lincoln, in his second inaugural, used the memorable and prophetic words:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

This was not with Lincoln a mere flourish of rhetoric, for in the few remaining days of his life his one purpose was to discountenance all talk of punishment or reprisals. He had fought to preserve the Union, and he felt that it would be an idle form unless the Southern States, which had fought so bravely, were welcomed back into the family of the Union with all their rights and privileges. He said:

We must extinguish our resentments if we expect harmony and union. There is too much desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights. I do not sympathize in those feelings.

And it is obvious that, had he been spared, the bitterness that divided the sections after Appomattox would have been short-lived.

To me Lincoln's great service in preserving the Union is not more notable than his spiritual conquest of mankind, and it was a signal vindication of the words of the apostle which, literally translated, say:

Faith, hope, and kindness; and the greatest of these is kindness.

His fine faith in the potency of this greatest force in the world was suggested in that noble passage of the first inaugural, when he predicted, in the darkest hour of the Republic:

The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

His example of tolerance has profoundly influenced human affairs until this day. It is noteworthy that two American Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, both stated that, in the most trying hours of their respective administrations, they tried to solve difficulties by asking

themselves what Lincoln would have done under like circumstances, and perhaps it was only a reflection of the same spirit which prompted a later President to forgive his enemies. I refer to an incident that happened in the administration of President McKinley, of which I heard at the time, when I had the pleasure of serving under him. There had been a bitter attack upon his Secretary of War, and one day in Cabinet that official, with a great deal of feeling, brought to the attention of the President that a certain officer of the Government had bitterly attacked him. President McKinley listened thoughtfully and then he quietly said:

"Mr. Secretary, if these reflections of which you complain were a criticism of you, they were equally a criticism of me as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

The Secretary, encouraged by this statement, quickly said: "What, then, Mr. President, do you propose to do?" To which McKinley replied, "Well, I think I will forgive him," and there the incident ended.

I recognize that we are not always in our political struggles as tolerant of criticism as were Lincoln and McKinley. In the heat of political strife we often say the things which we would gladly unsay and leave unsaid the due appreciation of our opponents to which we should give fitting utterance. But, disregarding these temporary instances of intemperate expressions, the fact remains that the two great political parties, in the spirit of Lincoln, try to observe, so far as the frailties of human nature permit, that fine maxim of the medieval church:

In essentials, unity; in nonessentials, liberality; in all things, charity.

So world-wide is the spiritual conquest of Abraham Lincoln that I should not be surprised to learn that the statesmen of England, after the South African war, in which they had poured out the blood of their youth, were influenced by the spirit of Lincoln when they voluntarily granted to South Africa the home rule for which the Boers had fought. This may not be true, but it is significant that in Parliament Square, over against the great House of Parliament in London, where England's greatest men are commemorated in marble or bronze, facing the mother of parliaments and the cradle of democracy, stands a statue of Abraham Lincoln.

It is an infinite pity that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln did not prevail in the councils of Versailles in 1919. The ghastly consequences of the World War and the resentments to which it gave rise made this difficult, if not impossible; and yet the world would not to-day be in a state of such unprecedented wreckage if the spirit of Abraham Lincoln had prevailed in that misguided council of the nations.

There was something of Lincoln's spirit in Woodrow Wilson's ideal of a "peace without victory." It was bitterly criticized at the time, and I was one of the critics, but the present condition of the world now gives proof that the principle of *vae victis*, or "woe to the conquered," can never produce a lasting peace. At the time it was uttered it was an impracticable ideal, for, as the combatant nations had poured out the blood of their youth as water, a compromise peace was then as impossible as would have been a similar peace in the midst of the Civil War.

A nobler interpretation of President Wilson's famous saying may be that after the victory had been won a fine and magnanimous spirit should be shown by the victors to the vanquished. Unhappily, this, too, was impracticable in 1919, for the civilized world had been shell shocked and was incapable of rational measures. If the same spirit which Lincoln showed in 1865 to the vanquished States had been shown by the allied nations to their prostrate foes the world would not to-day be in a state of almost cureless ruin.

Lincoln reached the height of his fame at Gettysburg. His now classic address was very brief. Numbering only 367 words, it must have been spoken in about two minutes.

Webster once said that the three essential requisites of a great speech are the man, the subject, and the occasion, and the Gettysburg speech, which so cultivated an English statesman as Lord Curzon declared the noblest speech in the

English language, had all three requisites. Spoken on another occasion or by another man, it might not have gained the universal acclaim which has been its exalted portion. The subject was the preservation of a democratic union; the occasion the dedication of a sacred area in which were newly buried the soldiers who had died for the Union; and the speaker was one who had borne upon his shoulders the weight of a great Nation, and who, standing within the shadow of his approaching martyrdom, was as that other Man of Sorrows, who was "acquainted with grief."

The speaker chose the occasion to reaffirm his faith in government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." There was a significance in this reaffirmation, which is sometimes forgotten. Before Gettysburg the European nations had become increasingly unfriendly to the Union, and the courts of Europe were even then exchanging notes for a joint intervention to destroy the American Republic, because it was to some of them a menace to the autocratic pretensions of their dynasties. To this challenge of democracy Lincoln proudly said that popular government "shall not perish from the earth." It was America's answer to a Europe still dominated by the reactionary councils of the Congress of Vienna.

The next half century was marked by the onward march of triumphant democracy. Nation after nation yielded to its imperious demands, and when President Wilson led the American Republic into the greatest war in history it was under the inspired battle cry that the world must be "made safe for democracy." This was a fitting echo of Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg.

It is, however, of profound significance that, so far as we can now measure with our limited vision, the present effect of the World War has arrested the onward march of democracy and resulted in a portentous retrogression to autocracy. It is true that when this greatest war of history had ended and the roar of the last gun on the long battle line had died away in distant echoes, it seemed for a little time that "government of the people, for the people, and by the people" had been vindicated, and that the world had been made safe for democracy.

Never in a thousand years had there been such a dissolution of ancient forms. Crowns had fallen "thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks of Vallombrosa." Ancient dynasties had perished and kingdoms and empires of a thousand years vanished into thin air.

And then a mighty change came over the world's dream of democracy. A reaction, swift and terrible, against parliamentary government, through which democracy alone can function, swept over the world like the shadow of a huge eclipse. Russia destroyed the rule of the czars but rejected democracy in accepting a class tyranny infinitely worse than the rule of the worst of the Czars. China became a republic in form, but is now in the welter of anarchy. Italy accepted the rule of a dictator, who, however beneficent his autocratic rule may be, loses no occasion to flout democracy. Spain accepted for a time the rule of a military dictator; democracy yielded to a dictator in Greece—the very land that gave us not only the idea but the very word "democracy."

Seventy years after Lincoln's vindication of democracy, popular government in the greater part of the world seems to be in more serious danger than at any time since Jefferson, like Chanticleer, proclaimed the "reddening morn" of democracy.

Human progress moves in a constant series of ascending and descending curves; or, to change the metaphor, its forces are at times centripetal and at times centrifugal. Man has, throughout all history, passed through a ceaseless cycle of integration and disintegration. Every age that has been marked by the concentration of power in the hands of a few has been followed by a redistribution of that power among the many; and, in turn, every democratic movement, when it has spent its force, has been succeeded by a period of integration.

No present fact is more significant than the reaction in many nations against democracy and in favor of one-man power. It matters not whether the one man be called a

czar, emperor, king, or dictator—the essential fact is his power. To-day half of the oldest nations of Europe are in the grasp of dictators. The revolt is not against democracy as a social ideal, but against the inefficiency of parliamentary institutions.

At no time within the memory of living man has Lincoln's ideal of a government "of and by and for the people" been more openly denied and flouted. If the parliamentary system, which we call democracy, is ineffective, resort will inevitably be had to the more ancient forms of power. The World War has revealed, as in a vast illumination, the fact that democracy is not workable unless there be a people politically capable of self-government. The founders of our Nation recognized this. Washington, Franklin, and Hamilton all said that the success of popular government depended less upon its form than upon the moral and intellectual capacity of the people. If they fail to take an intelligent interest in their government and if they are unprepared to show the spirit of self-restraint, which I have elsewhere called "constitutional morality," there can be no successful democracy.

It is easy for a people to be content with popular government when prosperity is general. Let there be in this Nation a prolonged period of adversity, and our institutions will be brought to a real test; and the prophecy of Lord Macaulay, voiced nearly 70 years ago, may have a terrible vindication.

Let us not lay the "flattering unction to our souls" that we have finally and completely solved the great problem of popular government. It is still, to use the words of Lincoln, "an unfinished task," and to it the living, from generation to generation, must still dedicate themselves. Our institutions are not static, but always in a state of flux.

A democracy can only function through party government.

I like the spirit of our mother country, which calls the majority in Parliament "His Majesty's Government" and the minority "His Majesty's Opposition." It expresses a truth that both parties serve the sovereign people, even when they differ as to the policies of the nation. To us the American people is "His Majesty." The large majority which the Democratic Party will have in the next Congress will be "His Majesty's Government," and the small minority, to which I belong, will be "His Majesty's Opposition," both playing different parts in a common symphony, but we will both serve the public by debating conflicting policies, for a fair and frank expression of opposite views often results in one of those compromises which are often a necessary ingredient of true statesmanship.

During my short service in Congress I have often regretted that, under the stress of our complex problems, this House becomes less and less a great forum for discussion. Debate serves a great purpose, and when the next Congress convenes I shall venture to suggest to the majority leaders a modification of our rules under which there shall be set aside each month two days—say the first and third Tuesday of each month—to be called the "State of the Union" day, and on those days two or more speeches shall be made by men of both parties, to be selected by the floor leaders, respectively, upon some issue of general importance.

This would have the advantage of concentrating debate upon some vital question and would attract far more attention than the unrelated speeches which are made in general debate when the House sits as a Committee of the Whole. On these days the House would again become a great national forum, and if this idea were adopted I believe the American people would follow the debates with more interest than I fear they now do.

The sound instinct of the American people still accepts democracy. In determining its merits, as in every other problem, regard must be had for the ponderables and the imponderables. Judged by the former only, our faith in democracy would be weakened, for its inefficiency in great crises can not be doubted. But the American people believe in it because of the great imponderable, that it is the only form of government consistent with the self-respect of a proud people, that it gives hope to the masses and raises

them in intellectual and moral stature. The average man, even when plunged in the "slough of despond" of an inefficient and at times corrupt government, sees beyond the "delectable mountains" and he struggles out of the morass and presses onward. Such was the spirit of Washington and Lincoln, and it is this invincible faith, triumphing over fear, that has made them the two great leaders of the American people. As long as democracy can produce two such leaders it vindicates itself.

It must also be remembered that the comparative success of popular government in America is due in large part to the Constitution of the United States, which is not wholly democratic nor wholly undemocratic. That great charter of government rejected the idea that the majority ruled by divine right.

Abraham Lincoln devoutly believed that the Constitution was the whole "law and the prophets" of popular government. His faith in that Constitution has been amply vindicated, for in all the violent storms of the last 25 years, in which all forms of government have been shaken to their very foundations, the most stable has been that of the Constitution of the United States. To-day it is the oldest comprehensive written form of government in the world. "We, the people," ordained it, and "We, the people," must preserve it.

Our Republic, however, can not be perpetuated by words written on parchment, even though they form so wise a document as the Constitution. The essential spirit of a Republic, without which it can not lastingly survive, is the faith of the American people in its wisdom and justice.

It is therefore unfortunate that the American people indulge in so much indiscriminate abuse of their form of government, and especially of its legislative branch. I imagine that each of my colleagues is the recipient, as I have been, of almost daily letters in which there are the most bitter and unreasoning criticisms of Congress. There is no adequate recognition of the earnest effort of Members of Congress to solve the difficult and often insoluble problems with which we are confronted from day to day.

Our critics fail to realize that the Nation has long since grown too great for its political machinery. There is reason to fear that our Government is a giant with feet of clay. We are constantly reminded how inferior we are as a body to the Congresses of a century ago; but our critics fail to recognize that an indulgent posterity remembers their achievements but casts the veil of oblivion over their deficiencies. There never was a time when the Congress was not a disappointment to the American people. The difficulty is that the impossible is expected of us.

Let me recall a picture of other times, which was drawn by a master:

If I were to be called upon to draw a picture of the times and of men from what I have seen and heard and in part know, I should in one way say that idleness, dissipation, and extravagance seem to have laid fast hold of most of them. That speculation—speculation—and an insatiable thirst for riches seem to have got the better of every other consideration and almost of every order of men. That party disputes and personal quarrels are the great business of the day, whilst the momentous concerns of an empire—a great and accumulated debt, ruined finances, depreciated money, and want of credit (which in their consequences is the want of everything)—are but secondary considerations and postponed from day to day, from week to week, as if our affairs wear the most promising aspect.

This is certainly a dark picture of another age of the Republic, and it is interesting to add that I have quoted one of the most courageous of men, George Washington. If he had his moments of despair, the present generation may be excused for some pessimism. The Republic survived the dark days to which Washington referred and the critical days through which Lincoln lived.

In a time when even thoughtful men are despairing as to whether democratic institutions can survive, we may well recall the memory of Lincoln as a great democrat. I use the word in its broadest and most catholic sense. He was a man of the people, and he loved and believed in the people. Nothing could shake his faith, and he poured out his heart's blood to preserve the noblest democracy in recorded history.

The two great democrats of American history are Franklin and Lincoln. Each was a self-made man and from the depths of poverty reached the heights of an undying reputation. With little education each became a supremely wise man, and yet each had something that is finer than ordinary wisdom and that is common sense. Each had a sense of humor, which not only confirmed his faith, but made him tolerant of human error. Each, despite his lack of early education, became a master of style, and each drew his inspiration from the Bible and Shakespeare. Franklin laid the foundations of the American Commonwealth, Washington erected the superstructure of the Constitution, and Lincoln preserved it.

It is natural that in this critical age men should despair of democracy as of all human institutions, but as long as a democracy can produce such men as Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln, we need not despair of its future. Our form of government may change from generation to generation in its ceaseless adaptation to new social changes, but as long as the spirit of Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln remains, we can believe in the rule of the people.

A great moralist once said:

The life of Lincoln should never be passed by in silence by young or old. He touched the log cabin and it became the palace in which greatness was nurtured. He touched the forest and it became to him a church in which the purest and noblest worship of God was observed. His occupation has become associated in our minds with the integrity of the life he lived. In Lincoln there was always some quality that fastened him to the people and taught them to keep time to the music of his heart.

My colleagues of the House, as we stand upon the threshold of a new administration, in one of the most critical periods of our history, let us be inspired by the spirit of Franklin, Washington, and Lincoln, who shine forever in the firmament of fame, as the luminous and steadfast Pleiades. [Applause.]

WHAT WOULD LINCOLN DO?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULLEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent address of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BECK] on the life and character of Abraham Lincoln.

I wish to address you for a moment on the subject, "What Would Lincoln Do if He Were President To-day?"

As you know, I am a southern Democrat. I have often been referred to as an unreconstructed rebel. My people fought in the Confederate Army and suffered as a result of the devastating effects of the Civil War. Necessarily, my viewpoint differs from that of a great many Members of this House. But I have never been so partisan or so sectional that I could not recognize the sterling qualities of the man who occupied the Presidency of the United States during the trying years of that unfortunate conflict.

Whatever else may be said of Abraham Lincoln, by friends or foes, we must admit his sympathetic consideration for the masses of people from whom he sprang, and his courage to translate his sympathies into action whenever the occasion required.

What would Lincoln do if he were President of the United States now, under the terrible conditions through which we are passing, and have been passing for the last three years? In my opinion, he would do just what he did do under similar circumstances during the Civil War. When a financial crisis came on and it was necessary to do so, he swept aside, with a wave of his hand, those mercenary influences that were attempting to control the finances of the Republic for their own special benefit and forced an expansion of the currency to supply the necessary funds with which to carry on the conflict as well as to guarantee reasonable commodity prices and maintain the purchasing power of the people.

If Abraham Lincoln were President of the United States to-day, judging by his action then, we are forced to the

conclusion that he would again scourge the money changers from the temple, and wrest this country from the control of those greedy interests and individuals who are responsible for the policies that are now squeezing the lifeblood from the American people. He would turn a deaf ear to the insidious appeals of the minions of concentrated wealth. He would refuse to be guided in his policies by the advice of selfish interests, or selfish individuals, who would perpetuate this panic and wreck the Republic in order to rise upon its ruin.

On the other hand, he would hear the pleas of the bankrupt business men of the Nation. He would hear the appeals of the distressed farmers, who are now seeing their homes swept away for debts or sold to pay their taxes. He would see the tears and hear the cries of the suffering women and children who have been made homeless and penniless as a result of the concentration of wealth and the contraction of the currency, coupled with the hoarding of money by the very ones who have profited most as a result of the ruination their policies have wrought.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, if Abraham Lincoln were President to-day, or if he had been President for the last three years, he would long since have recommended and secured the passage of the necessary legislation to provide for a controlled expansion of the currency, such as we are appealing for to-day, to bring back farm commodity prices, and restore the purchasing power of the American people, melt away our bread lines, start our factory wheels to turning, furnish work for our unemployed, bring new hope and new life to the American people, and cause us to move forward into a new era of prosperity. [Applause.]

AMENDMENT OF CHARTERS OF CERTAIN ORPHAN ASYLUMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 4673) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum in Georgetown, and the Washington City Orphan Asylum in the District of Columbia," approved May 24, 1828, as amended by act of June 23, 1874.

I may say, in explanation of this measure, it simply removes the limitation placed by the act of incorporation on the amount of annual income allowed the orphanages mentioned herein.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum in Georgetown, and the Washington City Orphan Asylum in the District of Columbia," approved May 24, 1828, as amended by act of June 23, 1874 (relating to the amount of annual income from property belonging to the trustees of either of said corporations), is amended by striking out "to a sum not exceeding \$25,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "and such clear annual income of each of said corporations shall be applied to and for the purposes for which it was incorporated."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mrs. NORTON. Gladly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentlewoman from New Jersey inform the House the reason why any limit whatsoever was heretofore placed on these individual institutions as to the amount of income they could receive and dispense?

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO] would like to answer that question.

Mr. PALMISANO. Of course, this is an old charter granted by the Congress. It seems that at that time it was customary to place a limit on all charitable institutions; and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin will recall, we had a similar bill in the last session in reference to the Acacia Insurance Co., which is under the Masonic order. They were also limited in a certain way.

Mr. STAFFORD. That bill was originally vetoed by President Harding because this organization was seeking to gain business under the name of a Masonic insurance company and thereby more or less inveigle the people generally into the belief that they had some authority in connection with a highly esteemed secret society. Thereupon, after the

bill was returned with a veto, this private organization which sought to have the advantage of doing business with others than those connected with the Masonic fraternity changed the name and adopted the Masonic name, I believe, Acacia.

At that time there had been other bills of similar import introduced, and I was wondering why that company, like other companies, could not avail itself of the general privileges under the incorporation laws of the District of Columbia.

In the last Congress we had another instance, where the order of Knights of Pythias sought to gain certain advantages that were not extended generally to corporations incorporated in the District so as to avoid having certain inspections made by the superintendent of insurance.

I am not in sympathy with these laws that seek to grant special favors, when there are general laws in the District of Columbia which would permit them to avail themselves of these privileges.

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that we have taken the position in the District of Columbia Committee that we will refuse national charters to private corporations.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to commend the action of the committee in taking that stand.

Mr. PALMISANO. In a case of that kind, here are two orphan asylums created by act of Congress. They have received certain benefits. Under the general law they may lose those benefits if they amend the charter, and this is the only way they can obtain those benefits that they have derived.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentlemen sets forth a good reason why the bill should be passed.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF TAXES ON FAMILY DWELLING HOUSES IN QUARTERLY INSTALLMENTS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14392) to authorize the payment of taxes and assessments on family dwelling houses in the District of Columbia in quarterly installments, and for other purposes. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for its consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited to 20 minutes, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULLEN). Is there objection to the request of the lady from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mrs. NORTON was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. DOXEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is farthest from my thought to consume 10 minutes, but I wish some member of the committee would furnish information as to whether any other municipality in the country has adopted the proposal sought here for the payment of taxes quarterly? That is to me a departure from any existing system of tax collection. I am heartily in sympathy with the other provisions of the bill, the deferment of the collection of taxes for this year, but I query whether any city in the country has adopted the method of quarterly payments?

Mr. PALMISANO. Let me say to the gentleman that Baltimore City has adopted the quarterly installment plan for three years. That was done in order to help small property owners to pay in small sums so that when the end of the year comes they would not be met with the necessity of getting the whole amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman know of any other city where that method has been adopted?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. It has been adopted in the city of Chicago.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is on account of conditions in that corrupt suburb of Milwaukee. In Milwaukee we have not found it necessary or proper for the payment of taxes quarterly. There has been a deferment of taxes for six months or even a year because of the financial embarrassment of property owners. It is a bill providing for all time, whether the conditions are exigent or not.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I am sorry to destroy the theory of the gentleman concerning the depraved condition of Chicago, and do not care to dissent from him, but that system of the payment of taxes arises under the laws of the State of Illinois at the present time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Anyone who is but slightly acquainted with the conditions of Chicago knows that they have been outrageous, and that the trouble which besets Chicago is due to its corrupt local government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In answer to the gentleman's query, I might state that the State of Mississippi and the municipalities of that State now for the second year are trying and, I think, quite satisfactorily, the quarterly payment of taxes. The plan follows the payment of income taxes, taxes being collected for the next fiscal year, and I see no reason why the taxpayer should not retain those funds and pay them quarterly rather than that the banks should hold them.

Mr. STAFFORD. In Mississippi, as I understand the gentleman, it is being tried out.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; it is being tried for the second year.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it is not permanent law; it is a temporary arrangement.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No. I said that we are now trying it for the second year, and it is quite satisfactory.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. My understanding is that the District of Columbia can not borrow money. Most municipalities borrow money in anticipation of the collection of taxes; and in view of the fact that the District of Columbia can not borrow money in anticipation of taxes levied and collected, it seems to me that a quarterly payment might be considered from a different viewpoint than in other municipalities.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will notice in the report that there is no reference whatever as to whether this has been submitted to the Commissioners of the District for their approval.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the District Commissioners are in entire accord with the bill. A year ago this bill was suggested, and they were not then in accord with it, but since that time they have come to realize that it is going to mean a very much easier method of payment for the people of the District on account of our present conditions, and they have heartily indorsed the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. We can all agree that by reason of the exceptional conditions prevailing they may not oppose it as a temporary measure, but do they approve it as a permanent law?

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman that it is my understanding they are willing to approve it as a permanent law. If conditions change, I presume they would have the right to come to Congress and ask for a change in the law if they so desire.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the other provisions relating to the deferring of payments, those who are asking the privilege will be obliged to pay 6 per cent interest on the remaining amount.

Mrs. NORTON. Yes. I understand that is the prevailing rate of interest.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of the time.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the part of the bill permitting taxes to be paid quarterly. The part of the bill that I object to is requiring the assessor of the District of Columbia to furnish the owners of property in the District with an itemized statement of the taxes that will be due. I have never heard of any municipality, county, or State government being required to furnish itemized statements of taxes in advance of the day of collection. The people generally know when they have to pay taxes. They keep up with it themselves. It is all right to furnish an itemized statement when the owner requests it, and under the present law the assessor of the District is so required to furnish such an itemized statement, but I can not understand why as a condition precedent to the collection of taxes the assessor must first furnish an itemized statement of the amount of taxes due, to the owner of the property.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the city of New York by leaving your name and address they notify you in advance of the amount due.

Mr. PATMAN. Under the present law they will do so here upon request.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Just by leaving your name and address every year.

Mr. PATMAN. Why make it a requirement that you must first notify the property owners before you can collect the taxes? The District will be in all kinds of lawsuits as a result of it.

Mr. PARKS. Would it not serve the same purpose if the bill said, "on request of the taxpayer"?

Mr. PATMAN. That is the present law.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I should be glad to accept an amendment to that effect.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. It is not mandatory as I read the bill. Is the gentleman talking about section 5?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The bill says "shall send."

Mr. GOSS. But it reads:

The assessor shall send an itemized statement of such taxes to the owner upon request made by the owner and filed with the assessor not later than—

Mr. PATMAN. Those are the subsequent statements. I am referring to the first part of section 1 where it reads:

The assessor of the District of Columbia shall send to the owner of each family dwelling house occupied by such owner an itemized statement of the taxes payable with respect to such dwelling house not less than 30 days prior to the time when the first installment of real-estate taxes for such fiscal year becomes due and payable.

In other words, in order to collect the taxes, in any delinquent tax proceeding, it would be necessary under the law to first show by the assessor that prior to 30 days he had sent the owner of the property an itemized statement of the taxes due. Unless he could show that, he could not foreclose on the property.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. The assessor at the present time sends an itemized statement to every man who owes the District personal taxes. This is no more than what the District could expect or require of the assessor, to give them an itemized statement of their property.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, my time is very limited. I think this law will cause the District of Columbia additional expense.

Mr. HOLMES. Not a great deal.

Mr. PATMAN. In the first place, there must be additional people employed to send out these notices. Under the law,

any person who wants an itemized statement can get it. Why send it to people who do not want it? The chairman of the committee has already agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. HOLMES. I have no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the assessor of the District of Columbia shall send to the owner of each family dwelling house occupied by such owner an itemized statement of the taxes payable with respect to such dwelling house not less than 30 days prior to the time when the first installment of real-estate taxes for such fiscal year becomes due and payable. Such statement shall include all real-estate taxes which are due and payable in such fiscal year and all installments of special assessments which have been levied, charged, or assessed prior to, and are due and payable in, such fiscal year, with respect to the family dwelling house occupied by the owner. Such taxes and assessments shall be payable, at the election of the taxpayer, in four equal installments, in the months of September, December, March, and June, and no interest shall be payable with respect to any such installment unless it is unpaid after the time it is due. Any real-estate tax or special assessment or any installment thereof with respect to any family dwelling house occupied by the owner thereof not included in such statement shall not be due or payable during the fiscal year for which the statement is sent; and any such tax or assessment or any installment thereof otherwise chargeable, assessable, or payable during such fiscal year shall be included in the statement for the next succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. PATMAN. I offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, line 6, after the word "owner," insert the words "upon written application therefor," and on page 1, line 7, after the word "house," insert a period and strike out the words "not less than 30 days prior to the time when the first installment of real-estate taxes for such fiscal year becomes due and payable."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have some difficulty in bringing myself to subscribe to the second substantive proposal of the gentleman's amendment, striking out. It is my opinion that the assessor of the District should be obligated not less than 30 days prior to the time to furnish the respective owners of dwelling houses a statement of the taxes owing.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that he should furnish a statement but should not be restricted to within 30 days. If they want a statement within 30 days, he should be required to furnish it. He should be required to furnish it immediately at any time, without reference to any 30 days' time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman knows that the assessor is not in a position to furnish a statement of taxes at all times.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman will find we have a very efficient office in the District of Columbia, and that they can furnish such statements immediately. It has been the custom to furnish them immediately.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is absolutely impossible for the assessor of taxes to furnish a statement before the taxes are levied. It takes time. The gentleman is destroying the very purpose of the bill by striking out those words.

Mr. PATMAN. I have no objection to a provision like this going into the bill if it is understood that in the collection of delinquent taxes the District will not have to show first that this statement was furnished 30 days prior to the time the taxes were due. I do not want that as a condition precedent to the collection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The very wording of the clause which the gentleman seeks to strike out, "not less than 30 days," makes the act inoperative. We should give leeway to the administrative officers to furnish a statement of the taxes.

Mr. PATMAN. I realize the force of the gentleman's argument, and I will not insist on that if no other member of the committee desires to insist on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I ask for a division of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the latter part of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment again reported as modified?

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, line 6, after the word "owner," insert the words "upon written application therefor."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. After the date of enactment of this act no family dwelling house occupied by the owner thereof shall be sold for delinquent personal or real estate taxes or special assessments unless notice has been personally served upon such owner or sent by registered mail, addressed to him at such dwelling house, not less than 30 days prior to the date of such sale.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish to inquire of some member of the Committee on the District of Columbia what the prevailing practice is as to requiring notice to be furnished to the owner when taxes are delinquent. This section prescribes that no sale shall take place unless notice has been personally served or sent by registered mail, addressed to him at such dwelling house. Is that the prevailing practice?

Mr. PALMISANO. I think so. It is a sort of summons. In Baltimore there is a law to that effect.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not want Baltimore to be too potent in determining the policy for the District of Columbia. Conditions are entirely different. Baltimore can raise funds to meet current expenses by making loans from the banks. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia can not.

Mr. PALMISANO. I think it is a good law. It is to protect the individual from the forced sale of his property. Sometimes a person may feel he has paid his taxes and then if he does not receive notice, the property is put up and sold without him receiving any notice at all.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. CULLEN, the Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. DOXEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 14392, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to find passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALE OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11504) authorizing the sale of certain Government property in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in their discretion, be, and they are hereby, authorized

to sell for cash, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe, lot 801, square 5990, comprising 97 feet, more or less, in rear of 3204 Brothers Place SE., Washington, D. C.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13378) to amend sections 416 and 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey the effect of striking out \$100 and inserting in lieu thereof \$500 in line 6, on page 1, of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will permit, the bill purposes to increase the amount that may be administered without going through the intricate machinery of law.

Mr. BLANTON. That explains the whole situation. I have no objection to the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that an explanation of this item appears further down in the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 416 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia be amended by striking out the word "fifty" where it occurs in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one hundred."

SEC. 2. That section 417 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 417. All property, except perishable property and animals, that shall remain in the custody of the property clerk for the period of six months, with the exception of motor vehicles, which shall be held for a period of three months, without any lawful claimant thereto after having been three times advertised in some daily newspaper of general circulation published in the District of Columbia shall be sold at public auction, and the proceeds of such sale shall be paid into the policemen's fund; and all money that shall remain in his hands for said period of six months shall be so advertised, and if no lawful claimant appear shall be likewise paid into the policemen's fund."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the words "one hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five hundred."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMATEUR BOXING

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6292) to prevent professional prize fighting and to authorize amateur boxing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever shall in the District of Columbia voluntarily engage in a pugilistic encounter shall be imprisoned for not more than five years. By the term "pugilistic encounter," as herein used, is meant any voluntary fight by blows by means of fists or otherwise, whether with or without gloves, between two or more men for money or anything of value except a suitably inscribed wreath, diploma, banner, badge, medal, or timepiece not exceeding the value of \$35, or upon the result of which any money or anything of value is bet or wagered, or to see which an admission fee of more than \$2 is directly or indirectly charged.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created for the District of Columbia a boxing commission, to be composed of three members appointed

by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, one of whom shall be a member of the police department of the District of Columbia. No person shall be eligible for appointment to membership on the commission unless such person at the time of appointment is and for at least three years prior thereto has been a resident of the District of Columbia. The terms of office of the members of the commission first taking office after the approval of this act shall expire at the end of two years from the date of the approval of this act. A successor to a member of the commission shall be appointed in the same manner as the original members and shall have a term of office expiring two years from the date of the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. The members of the commission shall receive no compensation for their services. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall furnish to the boxing commission such office space and clerical and other assistance as may be necessary.

(b) Subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the commission shall have power (1) to cooperate with organizations engaged in the promotion and control of amateur boxing; (2) to supervise and regulate amateur boxing within the District of Columbia; and (3) to make such orders, rules, and regulations as the commission deems necessary for carrying out the powers herein conferred upon it.

(c) No person shall hold a boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a permit from the commission, but the commission shall not issue any such permit except to a club, university, college, school, or other organization or institution which the commission finds is interested in the promotion of amateur athletics. Each such permit shall be limited to a period of one day, except that in case of any interscholastic boxing meet or similar contest a permit may be issued for the duration of such meet or contest. No such permit shall be issued to any person unless such person agrees to accord to the commission the right to examine the books of accounts and other records of such person relating to the boxing exhibition for which such permit is issued, and such permit shall so state on its face. A permit may be revoked at any time in the discretion of the commission.

(d) No individual shall engage in any boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a license from the commission. Such license shall entitle the licensee to engage in amateur boxing exhibitions in the District of Columbia for the period specified therein, but the commission shall not issue any such license to any individual if the commission finds that such individual has at any time or place engaged in any professional prize fight or in any boxing exhibition for which he received money as compensation or reward, and the commission shall revoke any such license if at any time, after notice and hearing, it makes such finding in respect of the licensee, and may revoke any such license at any time for violation by the licensee of any order, rule, or regulation of the commission, or for other cause.

(e) Any permit or license issued by the board shall not be valid for the purpose of holding or engaging in, respectively, any boxing exhibition which does not conform to the following conditions: (1) Such exhibition may consist of one or more bouts, but no such bout shall continue for more than four rounds; (2) no round shall exceed three minutes; (3) there shall be an interval of one minute between each round and the succeeding round; and (4) each contestant shall use gloves of not less than 8 ounces each in weight.

(f) The commission may charge for permits and for licenses such fees as will, in its opinion, defray the cost of issuance thereof and other necessary expenses of the commission.

(g) Any person who (1) holds any boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a permit valid and effective at the time, or (2) engages in any boxing exhibition in the District of Columbia without a license valid and effective at the time, or (3) violates any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the commission shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(h) The term "person," as used in this act, includes individuals, partnerships, corporations, and associations.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14204) to amend section 653 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may the bill be read for information?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 653 of the act of Congress, approved March 3, 1901, entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," as amended by the act of Congress approved August 15, 1911, which said provision reads: "Every such company or association shall pay to the collector of taxes for the District of Columbia a sum of money, as tax, equal to 1 per cent of all moneys received from members of policy or certificate holders within the District of Columbia, said tax to be paid on or before the 1st day of March of each year on the amount of such income for the year ending December 31 next preceding," is hereby amended to read:

"Every such company or association shall pay to the collector of taxes for the District of Columbia a sum of money as taxes equal to 1½ per cent of its net premium receipts from business done in the District of Columbia, said taxes to be paid before the 1st day of March of each year on the amount of such income for the year ending December 31 next preceding, in lieu of all other taxes, except taxes upon real estate and any license fees provided for in sections 654 and 655; and upon the failure of any company to pay said taxes before March 1, as aforesaid, the license of said company shall be revoked and a penalty of 8 per cent per month shall be charged against said company which, together with said taxes, shall be collected before said company shall be allowed to resume business."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey a question. Under the present law the insurance companies pay 1 per cent tax on all receipts, and under the proposed amendment they will pay 1½ per cent on net premiums. Does this bill come from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. It was prepared by them and sent to the gentlewoman's committee with the request that she introduce it?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; I introduced the bill by request.

Mr. BLANTON. And the commissioners are proposing it?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; they are sponsoring the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentlewoman from New Jersey investigated to find out whether or not this is relieving corporations of a tax that they ought to pay?

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that this measure was referred to the subcommittee of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN], and he is prepared to answer that question.

Mr. HARLAN. The difference, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, is that both sections 650 and 653 apply to premium incomes and are on the same subject. There is an apparent conflict to this extent—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman answer the question I asked as to whether or not it relieves them of present liability and whether or not their tax will be greater or less than it is now?

Mr. HARLAN. It increases the tax to the extent of \$100,000 a year.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. HARLAN. I am absolutely sure of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know where the influence came from that caused the commissioners to be interested in this matter?

Mr. HARLAN. I can answer that if the gentleman will let me continue.

Mr. BLANTON. There are only certain things I want to know, and if the gentleman will answer my questions so that I may get definite answers, I may not take up any time at all on the bill. I want to know what outside influence there was, if any, that caused the commissioners to get interested in this change.

Mr. HARLAN. They want to collect the additional \$100,000 a year which, apparently, the insurance companies are willing to pay to avoid future litigation growing out of the conflict in these two sections.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it is the commissioners' idea and not the idea of the insurance companies?

Mr. HARLAN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under reservation of objection, I regard this bill as rather important and I would like to have some explanation of the measure, particularly, as to this phase. Under the substitute amendment it is pro-

posed to relieve these insurance companies of all other taxes except taxes upon real estate.

Mr. HARLAN. And license fees.

Mr. STAFFORD. For this privilege of increasing the tax one-half of 1 per cent.

Mr. HARLAN. I will say that at the present time there are no other taxes and the tendency toward insurance companies is not to increase taxes. The effect of this will simply be to carry out what the insurance companies are actually paying at the present time and make both of these sections conform.

Mr. STAFFORD. Further reserving the right to object, how does the rate, as recommended by the committee, conform with the rates as paid in the States by insurance companies privileged to do business in those States?

Mr. HARLAN. It is very similar. The rates in the different States run about this way. I may say a number of them do not go as high as $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, but there is this difference in the District of Columbia. Insurance companies pay no fee and are put to no expense in the District of Columbia for their annual examinations, which are made here free, and even though this rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is a little higher than in some jurisdictions, the rate is acceptable to the companies.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to what the rate is in Ohio or Michigan or New York for doing business along this line?

Mr. HARLAN. I could not state that. At the time we had the hearings on this matter I had a representative of the corporation counsel at the hearing and also a representative of the insurance commissioner's office, and in my statement about the rates being substantially the same throughout the country, I am repeating what was given there by these gentlemen. I have not looked up any particular State and at the moment I can not give the gentleman what Ohio charges.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume the gentleman is in sympathy with my idea that we should not give a preferential rate to insurance companies doing business here so as to invite insurance companies of other States to change their domicile in order to get the protecting arm of the local government.

Mr. HARLAN. There is no chance of that. I may say that section 650, which has been the law under which all insurance companies have been operating in the District and which is the law they all recognize, was passed in 1901. The only purpose of this act is to make section 653 conform to section 650. I think I can give the gentleman the history of this in just a moment. In 1901 these two sections were originally passed in the Code of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say, parenthetically, that that was one year before I began service here and I am not acquainted with the legislation.

Mr. HARLAN. The history of it is short. I presume it is the only thing the gentleman can not remember. Section 653 as originally passed applied only to assessment life-insurance companies. Then in 1911 it was amended in an effort to make it apply to industrial insurance. The gentleman is familiar with that. The amendment was drawn in such broad terms that instead of being limited to assessment insurance and to industrial insurance, it was drawn so that it might be construed to cover all forms of life insurance. However, the insurance companies have not attempted to take advantage of this until just recently an opinion was asked of the commission, and the corporation counsel handed down an opinion that in all probability section 653 applied to life-insurance companies.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALE OF PROPERTY NO LONGER REQUIRED FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 14340) authorizing the sale of certain property no longer

required for public purposes in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I have an amendment that I think will be acceptable to the committee. It is line 5, after the word "sale," to insert "at such time," the purpose being to leave it discretionary with the commissioners as to when the property shall be sold. In these times they might not be able to get the purchase price.

Mrs. NORTON. The committee will accept the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to sell and convey to the highest bidder, at public or private sale, as in their opinion may be most advantageous to the District of Columbia, the old Potomac School property, lot 802 in square 327, containing 5,837 square feet of land, more or less. The proceeds from such sale shall be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 5 after the comma following the word "sale," insert the words "and at such time."

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CASTELLOW] five minutes.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, several weeks ago there was some discussion before the House involving, to some extent at least, a consideration of the conditions and practices in the chain gang and penitentiary of Georgia.

It was not my intention to enter into this discussion and I would not except for the fact that I have just received a bit of evidence, rather persuasive, and in consideration of its high character and unprejudiced source should be convincing. It is in the form of a letter written by a man who has honored with his services as governor the splendid State of Michigan, but who resides at present in Georgia, the Hon. Chase S. Osborn. I quote from his letter as it appeared in the Wiregrass Farmer, a newspaper published in Ashburn, Ga.

Chase S. Osborn, former Governor of Michigan, in a recent letter to Gov. William A. Comstock, of Michigan, said: "There is no more reason to criticize the prison system in Georgia than in Michigan."

"For many years I have frequently visited Georgia chain-gang camps. I have gone especially on Sunday to hold services. I have observed the chain-gang system in all of its applied connections. In my opinion it is far better than keeping men at indoor labor. The only time there has been any roughness is where incorrigibles are concerned. The men are well fed, comfortably housed, and almost never manacled in the daytime. When camps are moving from place to place to do road work they do convey prisoners in portable cells which look like cages. There is no more reason to criticize the system in Georgia than in Michigan. Now and then there are human abuses in all the States.

"No man e'er felt the halter draw,
With good opinion of the law."

Mr. Osborn also inclosed a copy of a letter addressed to Patrick O'Brien, attorney general of Michigan, in which he added:

I have known convicts to commit crime so as to return to the chain gang where life for them has been more comfortable than so-called freedom.

The treatment of desperate criminals is perhaps kindlier in Georgia than in Michigan. Georgia compares with any State in the Union in the treatment of its prisoners. This may not be saying a great deal, but it does mean that Georgia ought not to be singled out in its penological policy. The convicts are not overworked. In the daytime they are in the pleasant open air and are well fed. At night they are comfortably housed.

Except for the fact that this distinguished gentleman has come to reside among us he, too, might have shared the erroneous idea that a State which contributed Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, and George Walton in the early days of our history to the cause of liberty and later did its part in formulating that matchless document, the Constitution of

the United States, had so forgotten its traditions and become so negligent of its duty to civilization as to play the rôle of an oppressor of the weak and a torturer of the unfortunate. Though the extent of our country is great and its inhabitants numerous, we have a common interest and cherish a common hope. In order that these may be promoted it behooves every State to cooperate for the enforcement of the law for the promotion of commerce and the reestablishment of prosperity within our borders. This is a herculean task, impossible of attainment without the hearty cooperation of a united people. It is, therefore, imperative that each State lend its support to the accomplishment of this purpose, thereby contributing as much as possible to a common cause. [Applause.]

The amendment of Mr. STAFFORD was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] at Nashville, Tenn., on Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. J. WILL TAYLOR, OF TENNESSEE, AT THE ANNUAL LINCOLN DAY BANQUET, MAXWELL HOUSE, NASHVILLE, TENN., FEBRUARY 11, 1933

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, this is our fourth consecutive observance of the anniversary of the birth of the founder of our party, and it is, indeed, encouraging to note such a large attendance and such enthusiasm, despite the intemperate weather and the fact that we have just passed through the greatest ordeal in our party's entire history. Our heads may be bloody, my friends, but thank God "they are unbowed." We fought a clean fight, we kept faith with the American people, and our escutcheon is free from the stain of deception or misrepresentation.

We went before the country on a record of 12 years of honest, arduous, and constructive service, without apologies and without any effort to resort to the art of hocus-pocus or demagoguery. Our standard bearers courageously and unflinchingly faced the economic situation and demonstrated to those who were not distraught by partisan bias or hysteria that the Republican Party has met every exigency with fortitude and ability and has dealt with them with practical statesmanship instead of by art of legerdemain.

In my previous addresses on similar occasions I have devoted the major part of my remarks to our immortal patron saint. I shall not do so on this occasion, because this commanding figure in the world's history needs no encomiast. The marvelous and magnificent work of his heart and hand and brain, the innumerable volumes that have been written chronicling his imposing greatness, and the tons of bronze and marble statuary throughout the earth amply attest his place in history.

My remarks to-night will be confined to an effort to beguile you from the dismal wreckage of the last campaign to arouse your party interest and morale, and shall be in the nature of an exhortation to you to return to your tents and gird yourselves for the battle of the future.

Of course, we have suffered a most humiliating defeat. We were smitten "hip and thigh," as it were, by the enemy; but we should not be downcast or discouraged. There are worse things than defeat, my friends. Craven surrender and supine cowardice are far more dishonorable.

Every fair-minded person knows that extraordinary economic conditions, plus a campaign of wholesale misrepresentation and demagoguery of a type and magnitude hitherto unknown in this country caused our defeat. Conditions which every one knows were not of our making and for which we could not honestly be charged with responsibility, and which, as a matter of fact, had their origin in a Democratic administration, were so manipulated and exaggerated and dramatized by our opposition as to make it impossible for us to win. In addition to these unfair and reprehensible tactics on the part of our adversaries, they literally promised the earth and "the fullness thereof," and unfortunately the American people have been famous for their credulity and gullibility. Many years ago that great circus wizard, P. T. Barnum, discovered this trait in American character and cashed in on it; but even Barnum in his palmiest days was a piker compared with some of the Democratic spellbinders of the last campaign.

But, my friends, the day of reckoning is at hand and it is now up to these political Houdinis to deliver. They boasted that their miracle man would immediately devise means to end unemployment in this country. God knows that in his efforts to this end Mr. Roosevelt shall have the unqualified sympathy and support of every patriotic American citizen; and yet, what concrete plan has he or his party suggested up to this good hour to bring about this much-desired objective?

They sold the country on the theory that most, if not all, of our ills are attributable to the Smoot-Hawley tariff law; and yet since the election not one of them has had the courage to advocate a downward revision of existing tariff schedules. In the face of their campaign declaration for free trade or its equivalent we recently beheld the spectacle of a Congress controlled by Democrats championing and passing a bill in the House of Representatives which absolutely places an embargo on many of our leading commodities. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the sophists of olden times certainly had nothing on these modern exponents of the gentle art of hokum and ballyhoo.

Notwithstanding the fact that that great idol of the Democratic Party, Andrew Jackson, recognized the logic of an effective and adequate protective tariff, the Democrats of to-day, who never tire singing the praises of Old Hickory, don't seem to have profited very much by the vigorous stand of this rugged old statesman on this vital American doctrine. Speaking in the United States Senate, of which he was a distinguished Member more than a hundred years ago, this great Tennessean, in discussing a tariff measure, thundered as follows: "It is time, sir, we should become a little more Americanized and, instead of feeding the paupers of England, feed our own people, or else in a short time we will be paupers ourselves."

But, Mr. Chairman, the man whose memory we revere to-night, in his usual quaint and homely style, gave perhaps the best example of the beneficence of a protective tariff. Being interrogated on the subject of tariffs, Abraham Lincoln is said to have replied that he knew very little about the tariff, but that he knew enough to know that when we bought steel rails abroad the foreigner had the money and we had the rails; but when we bought steel rails in America this country had the rails and the money also.

My friends, the necessity for a virile protective tariff was never more obvious than it is to-day, and the Democratic Party, with characteristic delinquency, is just beginning to react to the problem. Due to depreciated currencies in European and Asiatic countries, along with starvation wages paid their labor, our tariff wall has been practically nullified and destroyed. It is now generally known that unless immediate steps are taken to restore our tariff barriers, our country will become the dumping ground of cheap goods manufactured in foreign lands, which will inevitably result in the closing of thousands of American factories and the swelling of our already tremendous unemployed columns. Mr. Owen D. Young, that gallant knight of Democracy, declared during the campaign that the tariff was a dead issue and should be so considered. Recently, however, I understand that Mr. Young has been abruptly disillusioned, since the General Electric, of which he is the guiding spirit, has been forced to close two of its largest plants due to the importation of a flood of electric bulbs from Japan, where the yen has depreciated almost half in value and where labor can be had for 10 or 15 cents a day.

American financiers were horrified sometime ago when England and a number of other European countries went off the gold standard. Our financiers wondered why this drastic step was taken. But in the light of recent developments the reason is very apparent. It has been established that these nations went off the gold standard and debased their currency with the deliberate purpose of subverting and circumventing American tariff laws, and the success of the conspiracy is attested by the daily closing of American industries and incident idle machinery, smokeless stacks, and increased numbers of unemployed.

It seems to me that it ought to be apparent to everybody—even to "the wayfaring man, though he be a fool"—that in the face of foreign depreciated currencies, the Ottawa agreement between England and her dependencies, the quota system of France and the trade bars and restrictions of practically all of the European countries, in self-defense Uncle Sam must not only rebuild his tariff walls but must embark on a 100 per cent "buy American" policy.

In the Democratic convention which met in Chicago last spring, a platform was adopted emphatically declaring against a cancellation or reduction of the debts owed us by foreign governments, and Democratic orators during the campaign employed this plank in their platform with great facility and grandiloquence. These debts were negotiated by a Democratic administration, a large part of the loans being made without Congressional sanction and after the war was over. These obligations were contracted out of money derived from the sale of Liberty bonds to a confiding and patriotic American public, these bonds being outstanding to-day as a charge against our Federal Treasury.

What's going to become of these foreign obligations? Every taxpayer in the United States is interested and has a right to make this inquiry, because their cancellation or reduction means a corresponding burden upon the backs of an already overloaded taxpaying public.

Recently three or four of the debtor nations, with considerable reluctance, met their installments to Uncle Sam, but a number of others, including France, refused to meet their obligations, and in effect defaulted. Think of France refusing to pay her installment of \$19,000,000 on the ground that she could not afford it, and a few days later loaning to Austria \$14,000,000. Appropos of this action of the French Republic, one of her leading newspapers made this remarkable and significant comment: "Did we refuse our millions to the United States, to whom we owed something, if only gratitude, to give them to Austria, to whom we owed nothing except the shells she fired at us during the World War?"

My friends, I believe patriotism should always take precedence over partisanship. I am an American before I am a Republican. I want to see Mr. Roosevelt succeed in all of his laudable and legitimate undertakings, and I shall be the last person to throw any obstacles in his way. However, there is a feeling throughout the Nation that somebody or some influence, under cover and in some sinister and mysterious manner, is trying to juggle our foreign debts. European diplomats are very astute and clever, and it is said they do not stand back on scruples when the welfare of their country is at stake. Early in the Roosevelt administration a debt conference has already been scheduled. These foreign debtors are not sending their emissaries here to perform an idle or perfunctory ceremony. They expect results either in the form of outright cancellation, reduction, or indefinite suspension. Certainly it is perfectly proper for our Government to extend the courtesy of a conference to those debtor nations that had the honesty and the moral perspicuity to meet their obligations, but I think it amounts to downright stultification if we extend the same consideration to those nations now in default. The whole country is anxiously waiting to see if Mr. Roosevelt will do this.

Mr. Chairman, America stood aghast a few days ago when Mr. Roosevelt invited the Hon. Sir Ronald Lindsay, ambassador of Great Britain, for a conference at the Nation's temporary capital at Warm Springs, Ga. Many American people are wondering if Mr. Roosevelt is trying to emulate extraordinary and melancholy example of his distinguished predecessor, Mr. Wilson, who assayed the rôle of both President and ambassador. The American people will not soon forget what happened at Versailles in 1919, when President Wilson, with a gorgeous entourage, and as his own self-appointed ambassador, went to France and undertook to commit this country to the unholy and nefarious League of Nations. With bated breath the American people are wondering if Mr. Roosevelt is undertaking a similar stunt.

Mr. Chairman, the ethics of international diplomacy are quite well defined. Diplomatic correspondence and conversation are supposed to be carried on through chancelleries and departments of state with the knowledge and sanction of the executive. What would you think of our minister to the great Court of St. James taking up a diplomatic matter direct with King George, to the exclusion of the Hon. Ramsay MacDonald? Of course, no one can criticize Ambassador Lindsay. He was invited by our President elect to our "southern capital," and it would have been a grave breach of the proprieties had he declined. It is interesting to note, however, that just as soon as the conference had concluded at Warm Springs the British ambassador took the first boat for London. We wonder just what message he transmitted from our President elect to His Majesty King George.

Stripped of its persiflage and its trappings, the naked proposition is this, Shall this eleven billion indebtedness be transferred from the shoulders of England, France, Italy, and the other debtor nations to the backs of the American taxpayer?

I do not particularly censure these debtor nations for their devious maneuvers in attempting to escape this burden if they can. This is simply human nature. Charity begins at home, and self-preservation is the first law of creation. Their attitude, however, reminds me of the story of the white man and the negro who went hunting. They killed a wild turkey and a buzzard, and at the end of the hunt they sat down to divide the spoils of the chase. The white man said nonchalantly: "Well, Rastus, I want to be perfectly fair with you. I'll take the turkey and you can have the buzzard, or you can have the buzzard and I'll take the turkey." Rastus, somewhat confused, said: "How's that, white folks?" The white man said again: "I'll take the turkey and you can have the buzzard, or you can have the buzzard and I'll take the turkey." After the proposition had been repeated several times, old Rastus finally said: "See here, white folks, how comes you never have said turkey to me?"

Mr. Chairman, I am among those Americans who contend and shall insist that these debtor nations say "turkey" to Uncle Sam at least half of the time.

And now, my friends, I desire to say in conclusion that I have thoroughly enjoyed every moment of this occasion. I always feel that I am a better Republican after attending a Lincoln dinner and after associating with those who never tire of paying tribute to the memory of our illustrious dead. Four times I have journeyed over 700 miles to pay my homage and respect to this sentiment, and in the interest of party solidarity and party success I want to see these annual ceremonies continued.

I would like to remain over a few days and visit with you and plan with you our future course of action, but on next Monday a tariff measure will come up in the House, and I want to be on hand to cast another vote for American labor, American industry, and American independence. I thank you.

MERGER OF STREET-RAILWAY CORPORATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 248, to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey calls up Senate Joint Resolution 248 and asks unani-

mous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 248

Resolved, etc., That paragraph "Second" of the preamble of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Second. The new company shall be incorporated under the provisions of Subchapter IV of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia and pursuant to an act of Congress entitled 'An act to permit the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes,' approved March 4, 1925, with power subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission to acquire, construct, own, and operate directly transit properties within the District of Columbia and either directly or through subsidiaries in adjacent States, including the power to acquire, own, and operate the properties to be conveyed to the new company in accordance with this agreement, and to acquire and own the stock and/or bonds of said companies and of any other company or companies engaged in the transportation of passengers by street railway or bus in the District of Columbia and adjacent States with the power to mortgage its property, rights, and franchises, and to conduct such other activities as may be useful or necessary in connection with or incident to the foregoing purposes, including the power to buy, sell, hold, own, and convey real estate within and without the District of Columbia. Said new company when incorporated shall become and remain subject in all respects to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia or its successors to the extent of the jurisdiction now or hereafter vested in it or them by law over corporations engaged in the transportation of passengers by street railway or bus within the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That before they are recorded, the articles of incorporation and/or any amendments thereto shall be approved by the Public Utilities Commission."

Sec. 2. That Congress hereby expressly reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have called attention several times to the fact that the charters of both of these street-railway companies provide that they shall never charge the people of Washington more than 5 cents car fare. There was a time when they obeyed those charter provisions. There was a time when they sold six tickets for a quarter; and when they were selling six tickets for a quarter and obeying their charter provisions they were making money. Every car that was sent out of the barn was filled up most of the time before it ever reached its other terminus and people were hanging onto straps in the cars. I have seen carload after carload pass down the Avenue so full that there was not standing room in them, and so have others who have been here for a long time.

A bill was pending before the Zihlman committee—I do not know whether I ought to mention the Zihlman committee because the reputation of the District Committee has improved wonderfully in the last few years—to require those street-railway companies to stay within their charter provisions and to go back to a 5-cent fare. The street-railway companies came there and fought the bill and killed it, and killed it year after year. We told them then, when they had their general attorneys present, as well as the presidents of their companies and some of their big stockholders, that if they just had business sense enough to quit charging the people of Washington 8 cents, and 7½ cents when they bought tokens, and would go back to a 5-cent fare with six tokens for a quarter, they would double their revenue; and we told them further that if they did not do it, sooner or later, they would find themselves losing business here in Washington, and that prediction has come true. I got on one of the street cars the other night at the House Office Building and there was not a soul on it except the motorman and the conductor. I rode all the way to the Raleigh Hotel on Pennsylvania Avenue before another passenger got on the car.

It is because they have been mulcting the people here with a 7½-cent car fare that the people of Washington quit riding the street cars and have gone to the taxicab.

That is the reason you find such a fight being made on cheap taxicab service. Four women, working in a department, or four men, for that matter, although I mention the women, because it is of more interest to them, can get in a taxicab at their homes and go to their offices to work and it costs them 20 cents, 5 cents each, and they can get a taxicab after they quit work to take them to their homes for 5 cents apiece. That is the reason they have quit riding on these street cars at 7½ cents. They can get a taxicab to take them right to their homes from their place of work for less money. Any person on earth with a grain of common business sense here in the city of Washington, except the management of these street-railway companies, can see at a glance that if they would go back to their charter provisions and grant a 5-cent fare as they ought to do, with six tokens for a quarter as they used to, they would double and treble their present patronage, and thereby increase, almost double, their present income. Why they do not do that, and why they can not see that, I do not understand.

But I rose really to talk about the taxicab situation here in the city of Washington. There are several thousand taxicabs in Washington, and there are 1,500 ex-service men who for the last year and a half have been driving taxicabs, who have been making enough to support their families, not in luxury, but to support them, to furnish a roof over their heads, something that they did not have for two or three years before that time, and to furnish their wives and little children with food and clothing, sufficient to keep them from suffering. Does not that mean something?

However, there is a deplorable situation existing here as to accidents. I want you to bear in mind that I am one of those who have been fighting for these independent taxicabs. I am one of those who believe that no monopoly like the old Black and White or the Yellow taxicabs should be permitted to run men off the streets and keep them from making an honest living.

We have a deplorable situation here with several thousand taxicab drivers. Many of them are irresponsible. Not a single move has been made here to require them to protect the safety of the riding public with liability insurance.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I am in entire sympathy with the gentleman's position, and I think it is entirely logical. How do these street-railway companies escape these charter obligations?

Mr. BLANTON. The authorities here permit them to do so. I went to the Public Utilities Commission, to Chairman Patrick, and I said to him, "General, why don't you require taxicabs to take out liability insurance?" He said that he could not do it without an act of Congress. He said he had to have an act of Congress to give him authority to do it. I do not believe that, because I think that he has authority now to do it, but he will not exert that authority without an act of Congress.

I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PALMISANO], and the chairman of the District Committee the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] will not let 10 days pass before they report a proper bill from their committee and pass it which will give the Utilities Commission the power and authority to require proper liability insurance on every taxicab that operates in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. I will be glad to grant a hearing to the gentleman on any bill he desires to submit.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want a hearing. I am not going to spend my time at any such hearing. I am too busy. It ought to appeal to the committee just as it appeals to me. If they think it is proper or right, all my good friend has to do is to phone down and have the commissioners send up a proper bill, and it could be passed with the help of these gentlemen in about two hours' time.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mrs. NORTON. I understood that power was entirely in the hands of the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. BLANTON. But General Patrick says he has not the power. He says the corporation counsel has told him he has not the authority. He wants to do it. The commissioners want to do it, but they say they need a bill from Congress.

Permit me to call attention to another thing. Do you know there is not a taxicab company in the city that is responsible? Name one.

Mrs. NORTON. The Diamond, I think, is.

Mr. BLANTON. Possibly the Diamond is.

Mrs. NORTON. I understand they are.

Mr. BLANTON. That is just one. How about the Black and White, and Yellow? They are not. There are some Members of Congress who have good, valid claims against them who can not collect a dollar. They have been threatening to go into bankruptcy whenever they start to push their claims. I am informed there is not a single one in Washington, except possibly the Diamond, upon which you could collect a \$5,000 judgment. I am not sure. Possibly the Diamond Co. may be, but is it not a terrible situation when there are about 4,000 taxicabs in the District of Columbia, many of them operated by irresponsible people, that there is only one company that is responsible?

Let us admit the Diamond Co. is responsible, for the sake of the argument. Why should not the rest of them be responsible? Why should not everyone that operates be responsible, so that if they run over some little child or some old man or some decrepit woman they can be made to pay for it? They ought to be made to pay for it. So why do we not give proper authority to the Public Utilities Commission? Let me tell you what happened the other day. This matter appealed so to our subcommittee which was preparing the bill on the District of Columbia appropriations that the subcommittee agreed to require that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. We had a proper amendment prepared in the general counsel's office. We agreed on such an amendment in the subcommittee and we agreed we would put it in the bill, to authorize General Patrick, chairman of the Public Utilities Commission, to provide for certain liability insurance for every taxicab. It came out in the papers, and the taxicabs made such a hue and cry and the papers began to fight it before it ever got started, and they killed it. They brought so much pressure to bear on that question that that provision was taken out of the bill. Why? Because the taxicab companies did not want it. Do you know there are three Members right now who have just claims amounting to \$5,000 against these taxicabs and they can not collect a 5-cent piece? Did you know that? Their claims are on account of serious accidents, and they can not collect a 5-cent piece. Did you know that? There are accidents happening every day caused by irresponsible cab drivers. They say it will put some of them off of the streets if we require insurance. Well, what if it does? I want cheap taxicab service, but I want safe taxicab service first for the people. I want that service to be safe so that it does not threaten and menace the life of every little child and every old woman and every decrepit old man in the District. If it will put them off the streets, let them be put off. Make them give a proper liability bond before they can drive on the streets of the National Capital and cripple and maim and murder innocent people.

Mr. HARLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield. Is the gentleman going to help us?

Mr. HARLAN. I am going to do the best I can, but there are a number of objections that I do not think the gentleman from Texas has thought about. In the first place, in the last appropriation bill the gentleman from Texas introduced an amendment preventing the District Commis-

sioners from compelling taxicabs to adopt a reasonable rate that would pay them to put in meters.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, wait a moment. I want to answer that first.

Mr. HARLAN. I have not come to the point of my question yet.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I want to answer that first. In the first place, I did not introduce that amendment. In the second place, it was introduced by the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. In the third place, it was adopted unanimously by the House, and in the fourth place, the only thing on earth it did was to prevent General Patrick from putting a meter system in Washington that would put the Black and White, and Diamond, and Yellow monopolies on the streets, and run out of business every other taxicab operator, and permit the Black and White, and Yellow, and Diamonds to charge, under their meters, for going from here to the Washington or the Raleigh or the Willard Hotel \$1.50 instead of 20 cents. And we would not stand for it. That, however, does not keep us from providing for the public a safe, proper, liability policy, which does not cost them very much.

I am forced to keep two cars here—one a small work car and one for my constituents. I carry liability insurance on both of them. I think the insurance on my Cadillac car costs \$85 a year and on my Ford car it costs \$24 a year. If either one of my cars hurts a person, regardless of my personal responsibility, my policy protects him. I would not let a car of mine be driven anywhere that was not covered by proper liability insurance to protect an individual should he be hurt by it.

In the District of Columbia we ought to require every taxicab to be properly insured. The cost of this insurance would not be so very much. I hope the committee will give favorable consideration to this suggestion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield me five minutes?

Mrs. NORTON. I shall be pleased to. I wish to announce at this time that we have a great many bills to be considered. I do not wish to be considered arbitrary but I shall be compelled to object to further requests for time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Were it not for the conversion of the gentleman from Texas to the need of some regulation of the taxicab situation in the District of Columbia, I would not arise at this moment to take the time to discuss the taxicab situation.

I believe even the person most casually acquainted with the taxicab situation here will agree that there is need of regulation. The gentleman from Texas advocates placing them under surety liability. This is not sufficient. This will not curtail to any extent the many taxicabs that are now floating on the public highways without regulation.

I think the gentleman from Ohio should be commended in his efforts at the last session of Congress to try to inaugurate the meter system applicable to all taxicabs in operation in the city.

Further, as to the question of surety liability, I may acquaint the gentlewoman from New Jersey, if she wishes to occupy any time in its consideration in the few remaining days of the session, with the fact that in the last Congress the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] introduced a bill placing all taxicabs under surety liability. It was not brought up for consideration. There is urgent need for more regulation than simply placing them under surety liability. They should be placed under the control of the Utilities Commission. The Public Utilities Commission should have control of the operation of the taxicabs. We should not let every Tom, Dick, and Harry run cabs, and these names are applicable to the operators of the many, many taxicabs now in operation in Washington. There is no regulation of them to-day. They are preoccupying the thoroughfares of the city, mowing down life recklessly without any regard to the human equation. There is urgent need now to have them placed under some regulation of the Utilities Commission.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

GEORGE N. NICHOLSON

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13867) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to reappoint George N. Nicholson in the police department of said District, and ask that a similar Senate bill (S. 5289) be substituted therefor, and ask that the Senate bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered, in their discretion, to reappoint George N. Nicholson as a member of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia, and his compensation to commence from the date of such reappointment, no pay or compensation to be paid the said George N. Nicholson from the date of his dismissal from the Metropolitan police department to the date of any such reappointment.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 12595) to amend the teachers' salary act of the District of Columbia, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, in relation to establishing the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges on a basis comparable with recognized standards for accredited institutions of like kind; to raising the trade or vocational schools to the level of junior high schools, and for other purposes, and ask that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentlewoman explain the real purpose of the bill? It is a rather lengthy bill and fixes the respective salaries of various teachers, principals, librarians, and the like. Wherein does it change existing law?

I may say, and I do not say this in any desire to criticize, that nearly every bill that has been presented for consideration here to-day is vacuous so far as containing any recommendation from the District Commissioners. The Members of the House, without making specific inquiry in each instance, do not know the attitude of the District Commissioners with regard to the respective measures.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I introduced this bill at the request of the Commissioners of the District; and I may further say that in every instance I have submitted our bills to the commissioners to get their reports, and when the report has been against the bill I have not submitted the bill to the House. I have been very careful about this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say to the gentlewoman from New Jersey that it has been customary for the clerk of the committee making these reports to append thereto the letter containing the views of the commissioners.

A moment ago we had up the question of changing the taxing policy of the District of Columbia, but there was nothing in the report to show the views of the commissioners in respect thereto, and their views were not developed until we got into the discussion of the bill.

In this case there is nothing to show what the views of the Commissioners of the District are.

Mrs. NORTON. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this bill was introduced at the request of the

Commissioners of the District. Therefore, of necessity, they must approve the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but those communications from the commissioners usually contain an argument that is influential in shaping the opinion of the House on various legislation.

Mrs. NORTON. I think if the gentleman will consult the report he will find that there is contained therein indirect approval by the commissioners. They referred the bill to the board of education, who in turn submitted approval to this committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. What change is made in the bill?

Mrs. NORTON. As I understand this bill, its purpose is to bring these business high schools up to the level of the junior high schools; it is simply conforming to the accepted thought of the school system in practically every large community in the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are we to understand that the present so-called teachers colleges are now being administered under different laws than those which now apply to our junior high schools, so far as salaries are concerned?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; that is my understanding; and this bill is intended to bring them up to the same level with the junior high schools of the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the principals in these teachers colleges under civil service?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not know.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Section 13 states:

The appointments, assignments, and transfers of teachers, principals, and presidents authorized in this act shall be made in accordance with the act approved June 20, 1906.

Does that take these teachers out of civil service?

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think so. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE] held hearings on this bill, and it is most unfortunate that he is not here to-day, as he could probably answer all questions much better than I.

Mr. GOSS. Are you familiar with Public, No. 254? That is in section 13. My only point is whether they are now under civil service.

Mrs. NORTON. I understand that that has to do solely with the teachers' salaries.

Mr. GOSS. It says it has to do only with salaries and not the qualifications.

Mrs. NORTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, as this relates to the District and every one of the commissioners favors it, I am not going to offer any opposition to its consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is the purpose of this act to establish the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges in accordance with recognized standards for accredited institutions of like kind, as to salary schedule, library staff, library facilities, and the secretarial and clerical staff of the central office; to raise the trade or vocational schools from the present elementary-school level to the rank of junior high schools, as to salary schedule; and to provide other necessary legislation relating thereto.

SEC. 2. That on and after July 1, 1932, the salaries of teachers and presidents of the Wilson and the Miner Teachers Colleges shall be as follows:

CLASS 3—INSTRUCTORS

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

CLASS 11—ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,700 per year is reached.

CLASS 12—PROFESSORS

A basic salary of \$4,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,500 per year is reached.

PRESIDENTS

A basic salary of \$5,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$200 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$6,000 per year is reached.

SEC. 3. That on and after July 1, 1932, the salaries of teachers and principals of the trade or vocational schools shall be as follows:

CLASS 1—TEACHERS

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,200 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,300 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,600 per year is reached.

CLASS 2—TEACHERS

Group A. A basic salary of \$1,600 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,400 per year is reached.

Group B. A basic salary of \$2,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group C. A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

Group D. A basic salary of \$2,900 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for three years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,200 per year is reached.

CLASS 8—PRINCIPALS

A basic salary of \$3,500 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$4,000 per year is reached.

SEC. 4. That on and after July 1, 1932, the salaries of librarians in the teachers college shall be as follows:

CHIEF LIBRARIAN

A basic salary of \$3,200 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, or until a maximum salary of \$3,700 per year is reached.

ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN

A basic salary of \$1,800 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for 10 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,800 per year is reached.

LIBRARY ASSISTANTS

A basic salary of \$1,400 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,200 per year is reached.

SEC. 5. That the board of education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to classify and assign the teachers and presidents in the service in the teachers colleges on July 1, 1932, to the salary classes and positions in the foregoing salary schedule for said teachers colleges, in accordance with such rules as the board of education may prescribe, and also to classify and assign the teachers and principals in the service in trade or vocational schools on July 1, 1932, to the salary classes and positions in the foregoing salary schedule for said trade or vocational schools in accordance with such rules as the Board of Education may prescribe.

SEC. 6. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to establish such new positions in the teachers colleges, in addition to those hereinbefore specified, as may be considered necessary by the Board of Education for the proper operation of the teachers colleges and to assign any such new position to one of the salary classes hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 7. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to employ in the teachers colleges, under and within appropriations made by Congress, such part-time employees in addition to the regular faculty as may be considered necessary by the Board of Education for the proper operation of the teachers colleges; and to establish the qualifications, terms of service, and salaries to be paid such part-time employees.

SEC. 8. Professors and assistant professors are hereby classified as teachers, and their salaries shall be paid in 10 monthly installments as provided in Public Act No. 139, Sixtieth Congress, approved May 26, 1908.

SEC. 9. The Board of Education is hereby authorized to confer appropriate degrees on those persons who, in the judgment of the respective faculties and the Board of Education, satisfactorily complete the prescribed course of study in the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges.

SEC. 10. That the Board of Education is hereby authorized to appoint, in the manner prescribed by law, the necessary stenographic and clerical staff in the central office of the Wilson and the Miner Teachers Colleges, in accordance with at least the minimum standards established for accredited teachers colleges.

SEC. 11. That the Board of Education shall submit annually to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia estimates of appropriations necessary to maintain the libraries and the stenographic and clerical staff in the Wilson and Miner Teachers Colleges, at least at the minimum standards established for accredited teachers colleges.

SEC. 12. That the Board of Education is authorized and empowered to establish occupational schools on the elementary-school level for pupils not prepared to pursue vocational courses in the trade or vocational schools; and also to carry on trade or vocational courses on the senior high-school level or in senior high schools.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word to call attention to the authority vested with the Board of Education by section 12. Is it intended by this section to allow the Board of Education to establish such occupational schools as they may deem needed?

Mrs. NORTON. I believe that is the intention.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not sufficiently versed with the condition of our school system here to know whether there are any occupational schools in the District of Columbia. I question whether here in the capital, where we do not put a premium on industries or trades, there would be need of occupational schools.

Mrs. NORTON. We have such a school here in the District of Columbia—the McKinley Technical School.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not really an occupational school. That is a manual training school and there are many manual training schools throughout the country, but an occupational school, as I understand the term, is a school where they teach the youth trades and the like. They are usually schools which are given over to instruction of children after their work hours, sometimes prescribing one day every week when they are to be employed in such occupational training as printing, plumbing, and the like. I know in my home city we have a very large occupational school attended by the thousands. I was not acquainted, from following the District of Columbia appropriation bills, with any school similar to this here in the District. I suppose the purpose of this section is to authorize the Board of Education to establish such an occupational school.

Mrs. NORTON. I think it is the intention to authorize such a school. It has been found necessary, I understand, here in the District.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment merely for the purpose of asking some questions to get the legislative intent with respect to these basic salaries. For instance, on page 2, line 19, in providing basic salary for professors, the basic salary is fixed at \$4,000 per year, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 per year for five years. To get the legislative intent in the RECORD, it is understood that, to get the benefit of this \$100 per year, they start in at a basic salary of \$4,000 and must teach one year before they are entitled to another \$100.

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words, before they can get this \$500 additional they must teach five years from the date this bill becomes law.

Mrs. NORTON. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. They can not compute their years of teaching which they have had prior to the enactment of this bill as increasing their basic salary.

Mrs. NORTON. Oh, no.

Mr. BLANTON. This is true with respect to all the other teachers and true with respect to the president, where the basic salary is fixed at \$5,000 per year with an annual increase of \$200 for five years. He must act as president for five years after this bill becomes law before he is entitled to this maximum salary.

Mrs. NORTON. That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Further, to get the legislative intent, with regard to the librarians, we provide for a chief librarian at \$3,200, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for five years, making the maximum \$3,700. We provide for assistant librarian at \$1,800 with an annual increase of \$100 for 10 years, making the maximum salary \$2,800 a year. We provide for other library assistants, with a basic salary of \$1,400, with an annual increase in salary of \$100 for eight years, making a maximum salary of \$2,200. In order to express the legislative intent here, it is understood that in passing these bills they must serve these extra years before they get these extra allowances and they can not compute their previous service as librarians anywhere in getting these increases. This is understood, is it not?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not true that the sum of \$3,700 a year is a pretty high salary for the librarian of a school?

Mrs. NORTON. I think it conforms with the salaries in other cities of the same size.

Mr. BLANTON. I have made some investigation of similar salaries that are paid all over the United States. Does the gentlewoman from New Jersey realize that there are many librarians serving in Carnegie libraries in cities for \$1,800 and less a year?

Mrs. NORTON. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLACK. And they are generally considered to be underpaid.

Mr. BLANTON. Some of the best women in the world are serving as librarians in Carnegie libraries in the large cities. If you can get a splendid woman who is trained as a librarian to serve as a librarian in a Carnegie library for \$1,800, why should you pay a librarian in one of these schools here \$3,700 a year, and this is just one of the many similar schools here in Washington.

Mr. BLACK. Generally speaking, I think it is a shame the way the librarians of the country have been treated. There is no finer type of mind needed than that required of a librarian, to do selective work in helping the readers and students, and it is a crime that they are so underpaid. However, I agree with the gentleman on the general proposition that if this is the schedule generally we should not go above it.

Mr. BLANTON. I doubt the wisdom of making these salaries as large as they are. I am against it. I want my friend from New York and the gentlewoman from New Jersey to go to the Congressional Library, one of the greatest libraries in the world, and investigate the measly little starvation salaries that most of the splendid employees of that institution work for now.

Mr. BLACK. We agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. BLANTON. I know some splendid women who have been working in that library for a number of years who are not now getting more than \$1,200 a year. When we permit this in the Congressional Library, I think it is out of line to pay the librarians in one of these schools as much as \$3,700 a year.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman that I think the qualifications required are quite different and this probably accounts for the difference in salary.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill as follows:

SEC. 13. The appointments, assignments, and transfers of teachers, principals, and presidents authorized in this act shall be made in accordance with the act approved June 20, 1906, as amended (Public, No. 254).

SEC. 14. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1932.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the figures "1932" and insert "1933."
Page 7, line 5, strike out "1932" and insert "1933."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The thought occurs to me that by the enactment of this bill at this session these teachers will be exempt from the congressional cut carried in the economy bill. I want to ask the legal adviser of the committee what is his opinion about it?

Mr. PALMISANO. I may say—

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not referring to the gentleman from Baltimore, who is the liquid adviser, but I am referring to the gentleman from Ohio, the dry adviser on legal matters. [Laughter.]

Mrs. NORTON. I do not think this has anything to do with the economy act.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is it; it has nothing to do with the economy act, but all the other officers are leveled down 8½ per cent.

Mrs. NORTON. I think that all the cuts will apply to this bill.

Mr. HARLAN. That would depend upon the wording of the economy act.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a later act fixing the salaries. I am glad to have the opinion of the legal adviser that the economy act would not apply to these salaries.

Mr. HARLAN. I would not be sure of it.

Mr. PALMISANO. There may be something to the contention of the gentleman from Wisconsin, this being a subsequent act to the economy bill. It may be that it may not apply.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the opinion of the legal adviser is worth more than the liquid adviser. [Laughter.] The amendments were agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE OF DAMAGE CLAIMS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13750) to regulate the bringing of action for damages against the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no action shall be maintained against the District of Columbia for unliquidated damages to person or property unless the claimant shall allege and prove that within 30 days after the injury or damage was sustained, he, his agent, or attorney gave notice in writing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of the time, place, cause, and extent of such injury or damage.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "shall allege and prove that" following the word "claimant."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "30 days" following the word "within" and insert in lieu thereof the words "six months."

Page 1, line 8, after the words "of the District of Columbia of the," insert the word "approximate," so that the line will read "of the District of Columbia of the approximate time, place, cause, and."

Page 1, line 9, strike the first word "extent" and insert in lieu thereof the word "circumstances."

Page 1, line 9, at the end of the bill and after the word "damage," strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following: "Provided, however, That a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department in the regular course of duty shall be regarded as a sufficient notice under this act."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will some member of the committee inform the House as to the reason for extending the time for giving notice from 30 days to 6 months? I believe it is customary to have a much more limited time than six months in which to give notice of action to the municipality.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it at the present time it is unlimited. The District was recently sued on an accident which happened about five years ago. The commissioners came in and asked that a 30-day notice be required. I objected to that, and inserted 6 months, and also a proviso that a regular report by the Metropolitan police would be a sufficient notice to protect the District. I had in mind, in extending the time from 30 days to 6 months, the interest of the person who would not be familiar with the law, and who might be in the hospital for 6 months, and by adding the provision that a report of the police department would be sufficient notice, that would also protect the unfortunate who might be compelled to go to a hospital, because I believe in all those cases the police do make a report, and that would also protect the District.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, directing attention to the subsequent proposal just referred to, that a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department shall be regarded as sufficient notice, or that it shall be equivalent to a notice served by the claimant, if there happens to be some report by a police force, would that be sufficient so that the claimant would not be obliged to give any notice at all?

Mr. PALMISANO. That is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let us consider that for a moment. I do not think that you are protecting the District in that way. Suppose a police officer makes a casual report of a crossing accident. The claimant may allow years to go by before he begins his action. Certainly the gentleman does

not wish to allow a claimant that much leeway. The whole purpose of this type of legislation is to force the claimant to begin action within a certain limited time.

Mr. BLACK. This is not a statute of limitations proposition; it is simply a notice proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; it is a matter of a limitation. The bill provides that no action shall be maintained for damages unless the claimant within six months from the injury shall give notice in writing, and so forth.

Mr. BLACK. This is purely a notice proposition. It makes no difference where the notice comes from. It is much better for the District that it comes from the police department because it would be more authentic.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not informed in respect to the statute of limitations prescribed by the District, in which to begin such actions, but in the State of Wisconsin it is prescribed that the action must be begun within a year.

Mr. BLACK. This is not a limitation proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am inquiring whether there should not be a limitation.

Mr. BLACK. They have to put the District on notice as to the accident, and, after having given notice, it may be that no action may be brought.

Mr. STAFFORD. But when a policeman makes a casual report of a crossing accident there is no intimation given to the commissioners that action is going to be begun, whereas if the person injured within the 6-month period gives notice it is presumed that he intends to follow it up by suit.

Mr. BLACK. On the contrary, if the person injured relies on the policeman's report and does not begin suit within the terms of the bill, he is out of court.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is there anything of that kind in this bill? It reads:

Provided, however, That a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department—

Mr. BLACK. Shall be notice. Notice of what? Of time and place—not a casual report that an accident happened but an adequate notice to the District.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the word "adequate"?

Mr. BLACK. Adequacy in time and place.

Mr. STAFFORD. The word "adequate" is not in the bill.

Mr. BLACK. I am reading the word "adequate" into the element of time and place. The corporation counsel prepared this bill and it is in the form that the commissioners want it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I doubt if it is in the form that the District Commissioners want it, because the vitals have been cut out of it by the proviso.

Mr. PALMISANO. The proviso was agreed to by the corporation counsel. He prepared it.

Mr. BLACK. They would be glad to have any legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the District is going to suffer by reason of this suggested proviso and that it would be far better to have it limited to six months and have the claimant give notice of the injury, which presupposes that he intends to follow it up with action in court.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "claimant," strike out the words "shall allege and prove that within 30 days," and insert "within six months."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, at the beginning of the line, insert the word "approximate," and strike out the word "extent" and insert the word "circumstances."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after the word "damage," insert "Provided, however, That a report in writing by the Metropolitan police department, in regular course of duty, shall be regarded as a sufficient notice under the above provision."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

MERGER OF THE GEORGETOWN GAS LIGHT CO.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13853) to authorize the merger of the Georgetown Gaslight Co. with and into Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia is given jurisdiction and power to permit and authorize the Georgetown Gaslight Co. and Washington Gas Light Co. to consolidate or merge upon such conditions as may be approved by the said commission, provided the said commission shall determine that such consolidation or merger will be in the public interest; and upon such consolidation or merger said the Georgetown Gaslight Co. shall thereby and thereupon, without further proceedings, be and become forthwith dissolved and merged into the said Washington Gas Light Co., and all the property of every kind, character, and description, rights, privileges, and franchises of said the Georgetown Gaslight Co. shall, subject to encumbrances or liens thereon to secure the bonds or other securities issued by said the Georgetown Gaslight Co., and to the payment of any and all other valid claims against or indebtedness of the Georgetown Gaslight Co. existing at the time of such merger, pass to and unto and become and be vested in the said Washington Gas Light Co. as its property, with all the powers, rights, privileges, and franchises now possessed by either or both of said companies, including the right in the said Washington Gas Light Co. to institute and prosecute in its own name any action or actions in connection therewith: *Provided, however,* That pending actions against the Georgetown Gaslight Co. may continue against the Georgetown Gaslight Co. until the merger of said companies. Actions or claims against said the Georgetown Gaslight Co. filed after the said merger shall be brought against the Washington Gas Light Co.

Washington Gas Light Co., after such merger, shall have the right and franchise to lay and construct, and to extend, maintain, renew, replace, relocate, remove, and/or repair, whether now or hereafter laid or constructed, gas pipes and mains, together with all appurtenances, connections, attachments, and appliances, in, under, along, and/or across the streets, avenues, roads, alleys, lanes, and other public places and ways in all parts of the District of Columbia for the transmission, distribution, and/or sale of gas within and/or through the limits of the District of Columbia for heat, light, refrigeration, fuel, power, and any other purposes for which gas or any by-product thereof is now or may hereafter be used; subject, however, to the provisions of the act of June 11, 1878, entitled "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia"; to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1893, entitled "An act making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1894"; of section 8 (public utilities law) of the act of March 4, 1913; and any other laws or regulations applicable thereto.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of enabling Washington Gas Light Co. to provide for extensions to its distribution system, for additions, betterments, and improvements, and for other corporate purposes, the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia is given jurisdiction and power to permit and authorize said Washington Gas Light Co. to increase, from time to time, the amount of its capitalization by the authorization and issuance of capital stock, common or preferred, or both, with or without par value, in such amounts and for such considerations—and in respect of stock preferred as to dividends or assets, with or without voting rights, or with limited voting rights, and having such terms, qualifications, conversion privileges, or conditions—as may be approved by the commission. The commission is likewise authorized to permit the said Washington Gas Light Co. to change all of the shares of its capital stock now authorized, issued, and/or outstanding into the same or a different number of shares issued pursuant to the provisions of this act.

All shares of capital stock of Washington Gas Light Co. hereafter issued for which the agreed consideration shall have been paid or delivered to the company and all shares of capital stock of the company heretofore issued, as well as shares into which such shares heretofore issued may be changed, shall be deemed and taken to be fully paid and nonassessable and not subject to further call or assessment, and there shall be no liability to the company or to creditors of the company on the part of any subscriber to or holder of such shares.

Said Washington Gas Light Co. may, subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission, amend its charter so as to make any or all of the above changes and/or increase or increases and/or classification or reclassifications, by following the same procedure and complying with the same requirements as are now prescribed in section 639a of subchapter 4 of chapter 18 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, as amended to June 7, 1924, in respect of a change of name by a corporation, and thereupon its charter shall be deemed to be so amended without any further or other act or procedure.

Sec. 3. All charters, statutes, acts, and parts of acts, laws, ordinances, and regulations inconsistent with or repugnant to the provisions of this act, but only so far as inconsistent herewith or repugnant hereto, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act or any part thereof is hereby expressly reserved in Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be compelled to consider this question sooner or later, and I want to direct attention to it for a moment.

I have just introduced the following bill, and I ask your most careful consideration of it:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the passage of this act no pension, bounty, disability, or allowance save and except insurance benefits on which adequate premiums have been paid, and hospitalization under existing law, shall be paid or allowed to any veteran of any war in which the United States has engaged for any disease, disability, or injury not incurred while in the service of the United States or resulting from such service: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to a veteran of any war who is permanently and totally disabled either as a result of service or otherwise, and not as a result of his own misconduct, nor to a veteran who has attained the age of 65 years, and whose gross annual income is less than \$3,000, nor to dependents of deceased veterans entitled to benefits under existing law. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the above act are hereby repealed.

I feel very keenly that this question should be brought before the country for consideration, and I shall make every effort in my power to secure consideration of this measure before the committee and the House.

During the last campaign the most effective appeal of candidates was an appeal to give them a chance to reduce Government expenditures and relieve a distressed people from the crushing burden of taxation. Those who have prepared their income-tax forms for the current period have had the increases brought sharply to their attention. Many militant candidates for office were clamoring for an opportunity to reduce Government expenses by 25 per cent, but I have only heard vague references to this since the election. Economy has been suggested in most every Government department and bureau, even to drastic economy in our harassed and much needed national defense in this time of world unrest, yet no effort has been made to bring before Congress for its determination the most generally discussed economy measure, which is non-service-connected veterans' pensions. The country is entitled to a hearing on this, and I propose to give it to the country if it is in my power to do so.

I have no patience with excuses—we are judged by our failure or success, and not by excuses. I feel, however, like apologizing to my constituents and my country for not offering an amendment to the veterans' bill which would have brought this question to a vote several days ago. In explanation to them, I wish to say that I understood that an amendment similar to this was to be offered to the independent offices' bill. The veterans' program was the last item in this bill; I had no amendment prepared, and the bill was concluded and immediately acted on with no effort made to bring this question up. I accept the censure and criticism personally, acknowledge my default, and offer no defense but this explanation.

My bill saves hospitalization for the non-service-connected veteran in these distressing times. It is wrong in principle; but the hospitals have been provided and the staffs assembled, and untold suffering and distress can be avoided during the emergency by continuing this relief, but it should be repealed as soon as normal times are restored.

My bill also preserves the award to totally and permanently disabled non-service-connected cases and to veterans who have reached 65 years of age. I have seen many of these hopeless, bedridden sufferers, and, right or wrong, I can not consent to take from them this gift of their country in their utter helplessness. I believe the country can and will gladly assume this burden if it knew the cases as Members of Congress do.

My bill does not disturb the relief for injury or disease incurred by veterans in the service, nor would I vote to take a penny from them.

For the non-service-connected cases drawing disability, short of total and permanent, I sincerely believe that to reduce the crushing burden of taxation and assist business, industry, and commerce to their feet will restore them to useful, self-respecting work, which would be infinitely better for them than the pittance doled out to them as pensions—a pittance to the individual, but a staggering sum in the aggregate to their country.

In principle, this thing is wrong. With the millions of men required in modern warfare, no country, however rich and prosperous, can for 60 or 70 years after a war provide hospitalization for every man and woman in it and a pension as well for every infirmity that afflicts mankind in no way even remotely connected with the service. No country can afford to defend itself at such a price.

In a period of 60 years we can easily visualize three or four different groups of veterans of three or four different wars, each numbering many millions of men and women.

Who is going to pay the enormous sums which will be required for this purpose? It will bankrupt any country that attempts it.

The fear of this expensive aftermath may, and no doubt will, seriously affect our foreign relations, and may occasion a policy of timidity and side-stepping when courage and determination are needed.

I hope I shall never see the day when our country will be forced, through fear of the demands of its uninjured defenders, to adopt this policy.

It takes only a slight stretch of the imagination to conceive of a day when we would say to an aggressor nation, we will pay you a billion; two billion dollars to avoid the expense of defending ourselves. God forbid. This thing is wrong; now is the time to stop it, and by this bill I am offering the Congress and the country an opportunity to do so. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

AMENDMENT OF KIDNAPING LAW—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4694) to amend section 812 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 812 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, title 6, sec. 36), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 812. Whoever shall be guilty of, or of aiding or abetting in, seizing, confining, inveigling, enticing, decoying, kidnaping, abducting, concealing, or carrying away any individual, by any means whatsoever, and holding or detaining, or with the intent to hold or detain, such individual for ransom or reward, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for life or for such term as the court in its discretion may determine. This section shall be held to have been violated if either the seizing, confining, inveigling, enticing, decoying, kidnaping, abducting, concealing, carrying away, holding, or detaining occurs in the District of Columbia. If two or more individuals enter into any agreement or conspiracy to do any act or acts which would constitute a violation of the provisions of this section, and one or more of such individuals do any act to effect the object of such agreement or conspiracy, each such individual shall be deemed to have violated the provisions of this section."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from F. B. Balzar, Governor of the State of Nevada, stating that the legislature of that State had agreed to the amendment of the Constitution of the United States fixing the commencement of the term of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 11461. An act for the relief of C. N. Hildreth, jr.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 188. An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works;

S. 222. An act authorizing adjustment of the claim of B. F. Hart;

S. 1586. An act for the relief of the estate of Peter Paul Franzel, deceased; and

S. 4339. An act repealing certain provisions of the act of June 21, 1906, as amended, relating to the sale and encumbrance of lands of Kickapoo and affiliated Indians of Oklahoma.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 311. An act to approve Act No. 268 of the session laws of 1931 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the manufacture, maintenance, distribution, and supply of electric current for light and power within the island of Molokai;"

H. R. 3033. An act for the relief of Ida E. Godfrey and others;

H. R. 5329. An act to amend section 24 of the act approved February 28, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve," as amended by the act of March 2, 1929;

H. R. 6733. An act for estimates necessary for the proper maintenance of the flood-control works at Lowell Creek, Seward, Alaska;

H. R. 7503. An act to repeal the Executive order of November 23, 1909, making the enticing of laborers from the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad a misdemeanor;

H. R. 7506. An act to repeal an ordinance enacted by the Isthmian Canal Commission August 5, 1911, and approved by the Secretary of War August 22, 1911, establishing market regulations for the Canal Zone;

H. R. 7508. An act to provide for the inspection of vessels navigating Canal Zone waters;

H. R. 7514. An act in relation to the Canal Zone postal service;

H. R. 7515. An act to provide for the establishment of a customs service in the Canal Zone, and other matters;

H. R. 7523. An act to amend sections 7, 8, and 9 of the Panama Canal act, as amended;

H. R. 9166. An act for the relief of William E. B. Grant;

H. R. 9385. An act authorizing Roy H. Campbell, Charles H. Brown, G. H. Wilsey, and Dr. H. O. Strosnider, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, main-

tain, and operate a bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.;

H. R. 13974. An act granting the consent of Congress to Bonner County, State of Idaho, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Pend Oreille Lake at the city of Sandpoint in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 14060. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River at or near The Dalles, Oreg.;

H. R. 14129. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across that portion of Lake Michigan lying opposite the entrance to Chicago River, Ill.; and a bridge across the Michigan Canal, otherwise known as the Ogden Slip, in the city of Chicago, Ill.;

H. R. 14200. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Alexandria Bay, N. Y.; and

H. J. Res. 597. Joint resolution to provide appropriations to carry into effect the act entitled "An act to authorize the distribution of Government-owned cotton to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress," approved February 8, 1933.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 14, 1933, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

934. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1933 and prior years for certain executive departments amounting to \$604,941.13 (H. Doc. No. 550); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

935. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1933 and prior years, amounting in all to \$650,990.08, and a draft of proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation "Buildings and grounds, public schools, District of Columbia, 1933" (H. Doc. No. 551); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

936. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1933, in the sum of \$68,600 (H. Doc. No. 552); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

937. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay claims and suits which have been settled by them amounting to \$113,027.61 (H. Doc. No. 553); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. RAYBURN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14411. A bill to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande at Boca Chica, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2012). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14460. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2013). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14480. A bill to extend the times for

commencing and completing the reconstruction of a railroad bridge across the Little River at or near Morris Ferry, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2014). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOCH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14500. A bill to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Kansas City, Kans.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2015). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HUDDLESTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 14602. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Alabama to construct a bridge across Elk River between Lauderdale and Limestone Counties, Ala.," approved February 16, 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 2016). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14655) restricting relief to veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 14656) to provide an additional tax on income from personal services in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 14657) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a railroad bridge and/or a toll bridge across the water between the mainland at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 14658) to define the exterior boundaries of the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 14659) authorizing the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay from a point in Baltimore County to a point in Kent County in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 14660) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to aid in financing projects for the construction of garbage and refuse disposal plants and sewerage systems or sewage-disposal works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEEDY: Resolution (H. Res. 378) providing for the consideration of S. 417, an act to provide a government for American Samoa; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 599) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the Council of the City of Minneapolis, memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 191; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing Congress to take favorable action on Senate bill 36; to the Committee on Roads.

Memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to set aside and apart February 15 for the national observance of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution No. 191; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, indorsing the appointment of Hon. W. E. Lea on the United States

Shipping Board; to the Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress regarding legislation to secure the farmers their cost of production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to enact a law which will aid farmers and home-owners to retain their farms and homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing Congress to confine all contracts to be let for work on the Hoover Dam and other Federal construction projects to American firms and corporations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. YATES introduced a bill (H. R. 14661) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Jarvis, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10389. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Montgomery and Schenectady Counties, N. Y., opposing legalization of alcoholic liquors stronger than one-half of 1 per cent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10390. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of citizens of Alva, Okla., urging enactment of the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10391. Also, petition of Roy Hoffman Camp, No. 8, United Spanish War Veterans, Chandler, Okla., protesting against attitude toward veterans' relief and activities of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Economy League, and certain individuals to further limit benefits provided by law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10392. Also, petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, urging protective legislation against importations from foreign countries with depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10393. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of members of Women's Missionary Society, of Battle Creek, Mich., favoring the enactment of a law to regulate the motion-picture industry and support of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10394. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of the Young Women's Christian Association Council, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of Senate Resolution 170 and Senate bill 1079; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10395. Also, petition of Woman's Club, Litchfield, Minn., urging enactment of Senate Resolution 170 and Senate bill 1079; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10396. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of the Frances Willard Branch, Franklin Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Columbus, Ohio, petitioning Congress to establish a Federal motion-picture commission for the regulation of the motion-picture industry, and the passage of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

10397. By Mr. LEWIS: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Bethesda, Md., opposing any reduction in salary reductions to Federal employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

10398. Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce, Bethesda, Md., favoring a sales tax as a means of balancing the Budget; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10399. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of W. A. Simpson, president, Los Angeles (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring prompt legislation to correct inequalities caused by depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10400. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Memorial of the citizens of Montgomery County, Ga., in mass meeting assembled,

submitted by John Underwood, secretary, protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10401. Also, resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Columbus, Ga., expressing disapproval of the acts of those Members of Congress who voted against increasing the Budget estimates for the Military Establishment of the United States in appropriations carried in the War Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10402. Also, petition of Hon. H. M. Blount and 31 other prominent citizens of Waynesboro, Burke County, Ga., urging an immediate investigation of the functioning of the Macon, Ga., branch of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10403. By Mr. PERSON: Petition of Ada L. Griswold and 25 other residents of Walled Lake, Mich., favoring the stop-alien-representation amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10404. Also, petition of Bertha A. Lewis and 12 others, of Hazel Park, Mich., favoring the Steiwer and Rankin bills; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

10405. Also, petition of the City Commission of the City of Pontiac, Mich., favoring House bill 14125; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10406. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, urging legislation to correct inequalities caused by depreciated foreign currency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10407. By Mr. SEGER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Paterson, N. J., favoring emergency legislation to protect American industries from exports of foreign countries of depreciated currencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10408. By Mr. SWANK: Resolution by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a law reducing first-class postage to 2-cent base rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10409. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, adopted on February 6, 1933, Resolution No. 625, urging that Congress set aside and apart February 15 for national observance of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10410. By Mr. YATES: Petition of John W. Bell, Alice C. McKemgh, Arthur R. Petrie, and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging support of the Dieterich bill, H. R. 14265; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10411. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eduarda K. Baltuff (Harriss), urging an investigation of the smuggling of foreigners into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1933

(Legislative day of Friday, February 10, 1933)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 4673. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Female Orphan Asylum in Georgetown, and the Washington City Orphan Asylum in the District of Columbia," approved May 24, 1828, as amended by act of June 23, 1874;

S. 4694. An act to amend section 812 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;